This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

+ *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.

+ *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.

+ *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.

+ *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at `http://books.google.com/`

Soc
2270
53

Soc
3270
53

HARVARD
COLLEGE
LIBRARY

CHILDREN UNDER THE POOR LAW

)REN

POOR LAW

NING AND AFTER-CARE

WITH

Departmental Committee on
Law Schools

CE, M.A.

DGE; BARRISTER-AT-LAW
N LAW CONFERENCES
GISTRATION OF THE POOR LAW"

DON
CHEIN & CO., LIM.
ER SQUARE
897

BY THE SAME AUTHOR.

THE BETTER ADMINISTRATION OF THE POOR LAW.

Crown 8vo. 6/-

Adopted by the Charity Organisation Society.

"An able and useful work."—*Athenæum.*

"Full of valuable information and wise counsel."—*Times.*

"An excellent sketch of the Poor Law question at the present day. . . . . No Guardian of the Poor is fully equipped for his office until he has read Mr. Chance's book."—*Economic Review.*

"Experts will be the first to admit the interest and value of the book."—*Poor Law Officers' Journal.*

"To Poor Law Guardians it will be invaluable."—*Spectator.*

LONDON: SWAN SONNENSCHEIN & CO., LIM.

CHILDREN UNDER THE POOR LAW

THEIR EDUCATION TRAINING AND AFTER-CARE

TOGETHER WITH

A Criticism of the Report of the Departmental Committee on Metropolitan Poor Law Schools

BY

W. CHANCE, M.A.

TRINITY COLLEGE, CAMBRIDGE; BARRISTER-AT-LAW

HON. SEC. CENTRAL POOR LAW CONFERENCE

AUTHOR OF "THE BETTER ADMINISTRATION OF THE POOR LAW"

LONDON

SWAN SONNENSCHEIN & CO., LIM.

PATERNOSTER SQUARE

1897

OC 2270.53 (1)
~~Soc 2270.53~~
HARVARD COLLEGE 1916 LIBRARY
Mrs. Bendower Evans
HARVARD UNIVERSITY LIBRARY OCT 16 1984

PREFACE

IN the preface to my book on the *Better Administration of the Poor Law*,[1] I excused myself from entering fully into so important and difficult a subject as that relating to the education and maintenance of pauper children, because a Departmental Committee was inquiring into the matter.

This reason exists no longer, for the Committee has issued its Report. But the Report seems to me to make it still more necessary than I felt it to be two years ago to examine into what has been done, and is still being done, with respect to the education and training of pauper children, not only in London[2] but in the provinces. For the discussion which the Report has given rise to, and which is still going on, shows very clearly how very little the general public really knows about the subject. Indeed, the effect of the Report has been to leave the public mind under the impression that all the monies which have been expended on Poor Law Schools might just as well have been thrown into the gutter for all the good the expenditure has done. I hope that this book may be the means of effectually dispelling this mistaken notion.

There are, so far as I know, only two books which deal with my subject as a whole; but I think it will be conceded that they do not entirely fill the field. One is Miss F. Davenport Hill's *Children of the State*,[3] and the other is Mr. R. A. Leach's *Pauper Children: their Education and Training*.[4] The object of the former work was apparently to advocate Boarding-out, for

[1] Swan Sonnenschein & Co., 1895.
[2] The Committee was only appointed to inquire into London Poor Law Schools and Institutions.
[3] Second edition, 1889 (Macmillan & Co.).
[4] Hadden, Best & Co., 1890.

Miss Hill enhances its advantages by depicting other systems in the darkest colours. The latter work (which I should like to see brought up to date) is a most useful compendium of the acts and orders relating to the subject.

In this book I have tried to give a clear and succinct description of the various methods in use at the present time for bringing up those pauper children who are either in Poor Law or other institutions, or are boarded-out,[1] while at the same time weighing as fairly as I could the respective advantages and disadvantages of each method. In this way I hope to be able to convey an accurate impression to the public mind of what Poor Law Guardians and District School Managers have done in the past, and are still doing, to mould the very difficult material which comes into their hands into honest and respectable working men and women. I have modelled the general plan of the book on that of my former one. The Reports of the Inspectors of Poor Law Schools—which are buried in (to most people) inaccessible blue-books—contain most valuable information, hints, and advice as to how the education and training of pauper children may be carried out so as to produce the best results. These reports should not be neglected by anyone who wishes to obtain a mastery of a most interesting subject. Miss Mason's Reports on Boarding-out, of which I have naturally made much use, are better known.

But I have thought it well, when quoting from these reports, to let the Inspectors speak for themselves, supplementing from other sources the valuable information they give.

I have made free use of the Report of the Departmental Committee, the value of which I have always acknowledged, in spite of the strong *bias* it exhibits.

[1] Boards of Guardians have nothing to do with the education of those children who are classed as *outdoor* paupers, except that they can withdraw the relief if they are not sent to school (*post*, p. 19). It is often forgotten how small is the proportion of *indoor* to *outdoor* pauper children. On January 1st, 1896, 54,052 children were receiving *indoor*, and 184,437 (including 5905 boarded-out) *outdoor* relief (25 *L. G. B.*, I). Of the 54,052 children, only 24,475 were being educated in Poor Law Schools, the great majority of the remaining 29,577 attending the Public Elementary Schools.

The plan of my book is as follows: An introductory chapter traces the history of the subject from the notable year of Poor Law Reform (1834) to the present time, so that it may be seen how great the progress of Poor Law education has been. Then follow chapters on Workhouse Schools, District and Separate Schools, Cottage Home Schools, and Detached Homes.[1] Another chapter describes the use made of Public Elementary Schools, a system which answers so admirably in country districts, where the children in workhouses are usually few in number.[2] Next come two chapters on Boarding-out, a system which is becoming so popular that the dangers which surround it need to be carefully pointed out,[3] and a chapter describing the use made of certified and uncertified institutions, and of training-ships. The various kinds of employment open to pauper children, and the means of disposing of them after they leave the hands of Guardians are next discussed,[4] separate chapters being assigned to the important question of their "after-care,"[5] and to the vexed question of how that disturbing element in a Poor Law School—the "ins and outs"—can be best dealt with.[6] The concluding chapter[7] criticizes various reforms which have been agitated for in recent years. A supplementary chapter,[8] which has been kindly contributed to the book by a friend who has a special acquaintance with the subject, contains some valuable remarks on the education obtainable in Poor Law Schools. In the Appendices will be found a criticism of the recent Report of the Departmental Committee, and various circular letters and forms which are of practical use at the present time.

I am prepared to be told that I have depended too much upon the reports and statements of Poor Law Officials for many of my facts. It is remarkable how the opponents of Poor Law Schools refuse to credit the facts and figures of those who have most to do with them, while they lend a ready ear to the tales of those who have never, or at least not in recent

[1] Chaps. I. to V. [2] Chap. VI. [3] Chaps. VII. and VIII. [4] Chap. X.
[5] Chap. XI. [6] Chap. XII. [7] Chap. XIII. [8] p. 351.

rs, visited the schools, and who are therefore apt to draw eral conclusions from exceptional cases, or to think that t may have been true of the schools in the past accurately cribes them at the present time.

, for one, prefer to get my evidence at first hand, and I have er had the least cause to doubt the truth of what has been told as to how well as a rule the children get on after leaving the ools, even if I had not seen piles of letters and photographs ifying to the fact.

Anyway, I must leave it to my readers to decide as to ther my book gives a fair general account of the work of r Law Guardians in a particular field, and as to whether r labours have been crowned with as much success as could expected, considering the class of children who come under r control.

must not conclude this preface without expressing my nest thanks to my friends, Mr. J. S. Davy, Mr. Vallance, Clay, Miss Mason, Miss Lidgett, Mr. H. G. Willink, Rev. oke Lambert, and most especially to Mr. J. R. Mozley, for kind help which they have given to me.

W. CHANCE.

ELDFORD,
September, 1897.

CONTENTS

INTRODUCTORY CHAPTER.

	Page
The period from 1834–1861	2
„ „ 1861–1874	20
„ „ 1874 to the present time	35

CHAPTER I.

WORKHOUSE SCHOOLS

The difficulty of securing efficient teaching	51
The monotonous life of the children	56
The evil of close contact with adult paupers	58
The difficulty of securing proper classification	59
The difficulty of securing proper industrial training	59
The unavoidable contact with "In and Out" children	60

CHAPTER II.

WORKHOUSE SCHOOLS (Continued)

Results of the system	61
Industrial training	71
Education	76
Health of the children	79
Discipline	80
Type of a Workhouse School	80

CHAPTER III.

DISTRICT AND SEPARATE SCHOOLS

Reasons for their establishment	82
Separation from adult paupers	86
Industrial training	86
Efficient teaching	94
Education	96
Economical argument	104
Permanence of teachers	104
Future of children assured	104

	Page
The Bolton Society for Befriending Young Servants	301
The Sheffield House of Help	302
The Young Men's Friendly Society	304
The Kensington Lads' Union	304
The South Metropolitan Schools Visiting Association	306
The Homes for Working Boys in London	309
The Lincoln Working Boys' Aid Society	312

CHAPTER XII.

"INS AND OUTS"	315

CHAPTER XIII.

SUGGESTED REFORMS AND CONCLUSION	328

SUPPLEMENTARY CHAPTER

Education in Poor Law Schools	351

APPENDICES

A. A Criticism of the Report of the Departmental Committee on Metropolitan Poor Law Schools	358
B. Certificates to teachers in Poor Law Schools	402
C. Memorandum of the Local Government Board on emigration	403
D. Circular letters on ophthalmia	404
E. Order of 30th January, 1897, on instruction of children	405
F. Circular letter as to industrial trainers	408
G. Various forms in use under the Boarding-out Orders—	
(*a*) Forms used by the Burton-on-Trent Union	409
(*b*) Forms as set out in the Orders	413
(*c*) Rules of the Bristol and Clifton Boarding-out Society	417
H. List of Homes for feeble-minded girls	420
I. Order of 10th July, 1897, as to outfits for children	421
K. Forms used by the M. A. B. Y. S.	422
L. Memorandum on boys who have left Sutton and Witham Schools	423
M. New scheme of the G. F. S.	425
N. Memorandum of the Local Government Board on Isolated Homes	425
O. Scheme of Isolated Homes for the Whitechapel Union	427

ABBREVIATIONS

P. L. C. refers to the Reports of the Poor Law Commissioners.
P. L. B. „ „ „ Poor Law Board.
L. G. B. „ „ „ Local Government Board.

CHILDREN UNDER THE POOR LAW

INTRODUCTORY CHAPTER

IN this chapter we propose to trace as briefly as possible the history of the Poor Law, since the reform of 1834, in its dealings with that class of children who are thrown upon it for support. We hope that in so doing we are serving a useful purpose, for it is only by a study of the mistakes and failures of the past that we can hope to steer clear of them in the future, and so maintain steady progress.

This chapter, then, must be regarded as purely narrative, and we have introduced as little discussion into it as possible. Still it establishes, we think, two important facts:—(1) that the history of the Poor Law in its dealings with pauper children has been one of continual improvement; and (2) that the success or failure of any system which may be adopted must depend almost entirely upon administration.

As to this second point, although reform has followed upon reform—and at the present time no one defends the education of children in a workhouse—it is doubtful whether any existing system can show better results than did the Atcham Workhouse school, to which we refer later in this chapter,[1] more than forty years ago. There we see an inferior system succeeding simply by reason of good administration. On the other hand, bad administration will ruin the very best system that it is possible to devise.

We may conveniently divide the chapter into three parts, the first dealing with the history of the period from 1834 to 1861, the second with that from 1861 to 1874, and the third with that from 1874 to the present time. Up to 1861 the workhouse school held the field. After this date we find that system gradually falling into disfavour, mainly owing to the adverse Report of the Royal Commission of 1859, which so strongly advocated these schools being replaced by district schools.

[1] *Post*, p. 15.

During the second period we find the latter system being gradually extended in London; while from the important Report of Mrs. Nassau Senior may be said to date the loss of faith in the virtues of large schools, and the rapid growth of other systems of dealing with the children, which are described in this book.

(1) The Period from 1834 to 1861.

It was with the intention of improving the administration of the Poor Law generally that the Act of 1834 was passed, and naturally the case of pauper children was not neglected by the Poor Law Commissioners, who were appointed under that Act. Indeed, one of the first matters to which they directed their attention after their appointment was the better education and training of these children. In by far the greater number of workhouses outside London the young were at that time merely trained in ignorance, idleness, and vice.[1] According to Mr. Chadwick, than whom no person was better acquainted with the whole subject of Poor Law Administration, not one-third of the children at that time got into any respectable employment. "The girls were pretty enough to be on the streets, the boys were at large as vagrants, and the Bridewells were pretty full of parish vagrants."[2] Dr. Kay, writing in 1836, said:[3]

"The education provided for the children sent to the workhouses was valueless, and the children born and bred there were idle and profligate. The means for promoting good morals were so totally wanting in most of these establishments, the reward of idleness was so abundant, the incentives to vice so rife, that an observer might have been excused the inquiry whether on account of the lack of employment for the governors of county gaols, it had been considered desirable to create seminaries for the preparation of victims of the penal code."[4]

The Commissioners also, in their 4th Annual Report in 1838, describe the state of things existing previously to the formation of Unions as follows:[5]

"The children, who were for the most part orphans, bastards, and deserted children, continued to remain inmates of the workhouse long after the period at which they might have earned their subsistence by their own exertions; and those who obtained situations, or were apprenticed by means of the parish funds, turned out as might be

[1] Report, 1885 edit., p. 34.
[2] South-Eastern Poor Law Conference, 1871.
[3] 2 *P. L. C.*, Report on Workhouses in Suffolk and Norfolk.
[4] 2 *P. L. C.*, App. B., pp. 163, 164. [5] 4 *P. L. C.*, p. 89.

expected of children whose education was utterly neglected or at best confided to the superintendence of a pauper. They rarely remained long with their employer, but returned to the workhouse —which, so far from being to them an object of dislike, they regarded as their home, and which they looked forward to as the ultimate asylum of their old age. In this manner the workhouse, instead of diminishing, increased pauperism, by keeping up a constant supply of that class of persons who most frequently, and for the longest period, became its inmates. Pauperism, however, was only one of the evils which resulted from the neglect to provide proper means of instruction for destitute children. Those who have ascertained the early history of persons who in a greater or less degree have offended against the laws, have found that a large proportion have passed their infancy and youth in the workhouse, and can trace the formation of the habits which have led them to the commission of crime to the entire want of moral training in these institutions."

The system of compulsory apprenticeship was in full vigour, with all the evils attaching thereto so vividly described in the early reports of the Sub-Commissioners.[1]

In London the workhouses seem to have been somewhat better managed than those in the country, though in some the children were not separated from the adults, were instructed by paupers, and received no industrial training, while their moral training was altogether neglected.[2] Many of the children were "farmed out" in private establishments. A full description of one of these establishments, with an average of 650 children, is given by Dr. Arnott in the 2nd Annual Report of the Poor Law Commissioners.[3] The arrangements in them were in all respects imperfect, and especially so in everything that related to the religious, moral, and industrial training of the children. The children under six years of age had, by 7 Geo. III. ch. 39, to be maintained at a distance of three or four miles, according to their age, from the Metropolis, and were either kept in separate establishments belonging to particular parishes and managed by the parish officers, or boarded out by contract in private establishments.[4]

By the establishment of the Union workhouse and proper classification, the Poor Law Commissioners hoped that the young might imbibe religious and moral principles and be provided with adequate instructors.[5] Indeed, the formation of Unions enabled the old parish

[1] *e.g.*, Mr. Gilbert's Report, 2 *P. L. C.*, pp. 343-390.
[2] 4 *P. L. C.*, App. C., p. 145.
[3] 2 *P. L. C.*, App. C., p. 488. See also 4 *P. L. C.*, p. 146.
[4] 2 *P. L. C.*, p. 10. After the passing of the Act 7 & 8 Vict. ch. 101, it ceased to be compulsory on the Metropolitan parishes to send their young children into the country for nurture and maintenance. [5] 1 *P. L. C.*, p. 229.

workhouse to be utilised in many cases for the children.[1] In the first Orders and Regulations issued by the Commissioners in 1835 for the management of a workhouse, provision was made for the appointment of a schoolmaster and schoolmistress, who were to instruct the boys and girls for three of the working hours at least every day, in reading, writing, and in the principles of the Christian religion, and such other instruction was to be given them as might train them to habits of usefulness, industry, and virtue. These Orders were, however, merely tentative and only applied in particular cases.

In addition to this the Commissioners, acting upon the principle of the Statute of Elizabeth (39 Eliz. ch. 3), which provided that "order shall be taken from time to time for setting to work the children of all such whose parents shall not be able to maintain them," impressed upon the Guardians and officials the importance of obtaining independent employment for them outside the workhouse as soon as they were old enough to go out to work or into service.[2] Their efforts were rewarded by success, for as early as 1836 they report that the training already communicated to children by better appointed schoolmasters, and a better mode of instruction in the common requirements of reading and writing, had already produced some of the effects intended, and that the children so trained were beginning to be considered better qualified for service.[3]

Thus we find Mr. Tufnell writing as follows in 1836:[4]

"The change in the condition of orphan and deserted children when compared with what it was before the formation of Unions, is the most gratifying that can be imagined. Formerly, ill-clothed, ill-kept, uneducated, they were turned out to form the germ of future paupers, and to become the worst members of society. In fact, to have been brought up in a workhouse was usually considered a blot in a labourer's character and an obstacle to his getting employment. The change from this state of things is so thorough and complete, so precisely the contrary of what it was before, that the spectacle of this glaring improvement alone seems to reconcile many persons otherwise hostile to the new system. 'Our children's workhouse,' writes to me a magistrate in the Penshurst Union, 'has been the least unpopular thing in our Union.' 'The youth of both sexes,' says the chairman of the Eastry Union, 'are not only healthy but happy. They are in their respective schools six hours each day, and have such advantages of instruction as they could not have possibly had under their improvident parents. These are indeed invaluable benefits, as they will be trained to be useful and good members of society, instead of adding to the

[1] For an instance of the beneficial effects see Mr. Gilbert's Report, 1 *P. L. C.*, p. 256. [2] 2 *P. L. C.*, p. 35. [3] 2 *P. L. C.*, p. 35.

[4] Report on Kent, 2 *P. L. C.*, App. B., pp. 208, 9. See also Mr. Hawley's Report on Sussex, *ibid.*, p. 216.

future mass of human misery and depravity.' 'I have had many women coming to thank me,' says the Hollingbourne Relieving Officer, 'for taking their children away from them; they have been to see their children, and see they are so much better contented and better off. Some of them have had liberty to take their children out, and they have refused to do so, because they say it will make them discontented; they are so much better kept than at home.' In the North Aylesford Union the children are so excellently brought up that they have obtained a high character in the neighbourhood, and the master is overwhelmed with applications for servants from the workhouse. He has at the present time upwards of twenty applications that he cannot comply with. Formerly a workhouse was the exact place which anyone seeking a servant would avoid; now several persons have mentioned to me their intention of always taking their servants from the workhouse."

But the efforts of the Commissioners must have been sadly hampered by the generally backward state of national education at this time. An amusing example of this is afforded by the request of the Bedford Guardians in 1836 that the schoolmaster in their workhouse might teach *reading* only. "The Board did not recommend this on the ground of economy, but on that of principle, as they were desirous of avoiding greater advantages to the inmates of the workhouse than to the poor children out of it; withdrawing thereby as much as possible any premium or inducement to the frequenting the workhouse." We are not surprised to hear that the Commissioners did not accede to the application, basing their refusal on the following grounds: (1) that the workhouse discipline would be a sufficient deterrent; (2) that schools would doubtless soon be accessible to the children of independent labourers, which would give an equally good education to that of the workhouse; (3) that it was important that workhouse children should be given a good chance of getting on in the world; and (4) that workhouse children should not be treated so as to fix upon them any permanent stigma, in that all other children who learnt to read, learnt also to write, and to be able to read while ignorant of the art of writing, would be a distinguishing mark of those who had received a workhouse education.[1]

There can, indeed, be no doubt that in many of the reformed workhouses the education and training given to children was much better than that given to children outside its walls;[2] for the Commissioners, while careful that their food, clothes, and lodging should

[1] 2 *P. L. C.*, p. 529.

[2] Thus Mr. Tufnell wrote in 1836 that "three months' education in a well-conducted workhouse was worth to the children almost as many years of such instruction as they can get at home by attending village schools." 2 *P. L. C.*, App., p. 209.

not be elevated above that of the household of the self-supporting labourer, rightly decided that they ought not to lower their standard of education on the same grounds. They regarded education as the most important means of eradicating the germs of pauperism from the rising generation, and as the best protection for the institutions of society.[1]

But the difficulty of obtaining efficient teachers for the workhouse schools, of securing proper classification, and of giving suitable industrial training to the children, was a stumbling-block in the way of improvement. Both Dr. Kay and Mr. Hall in their Reports on the Training of Pauper Children in 1838[2] refer to these drawbacks, and the former compares the industrial training which a labourer's child got with that of the workhouse child, who had to learn his trade or calling by means of apprenticeship under a most pernicious system.[3] Their remedy was the establishment of central or district schools, which would enable the education of pauper children to be conducted on a more effective system, with a better class of teachers, and on more economical terms. This is the first we hear of the "District School," which has lately been subjected to such severe criticism.

Dr. Kay had a grand scheme for establishing one hundred of these schools in England and Wales, whereby the 50,000 children who were inmates of workhouses in 1839, would be separated from the chance of a polluting association with the adult inmates. In such institutions "they would not be daily taught the lesson of dependence, of which the whole apparatus of a workhouse is the symbol; the school management would be unencumbered with the obstructions that it now encounters from the interference of the workhouse routine; and the whole of the moral relations of the district school would assume a character of hopefulness and enterprise better fitted to prepare the children for conflict with the perils and difficulties of a struggle for independence than anything which their present situation affords."[4]

His idea of a district school was derived from the success attending the private establishment of a Mr. Aubin at Norwood, which contained no fewer than 1,000 children.[5]

The Commissioners expressed their concurrence with the views of the two Assistant Commissioners, although they could not give effect to them without special legislation.[6] Indeed, the arguments in favour of the "District School" as against the "Workhouse School" were

[1] *Cf.* 4 *P. L. C.*, p. 90, and App. B., p. 228.
[2] 4 *P. L. C.*, pp. 228–272.
[3] 4 *P. L. C.*, pp. 232–234.
[4] 5 *P. L. C.*, App. C., p. 158.
[5] For a full account of this establishment see 2 *P. L. C.*, pp. 488–494, and 5 *P. L. C.*, pp. 147–156.
[6] 5 *P. L. C.*, p. 90.

unanswerable, and have nowhere been better or more concisely set out than in a letter from the master of the Boston Workhouse to the Commissioners;[1] for, generally speaking, there can be no doubt that the workhouse schools were inefficiently conducted owing to the difficulties above mentioned. Mr. Tufnell tells us that he, at that period as Assistant Poor Law Commissioner, paid particular attention to the education of pauper children, and, referring to his reports, he found that the schoolmasters and mistresses were in some cases almost ludicrously disqualified for their offices. He says:[2]

"I attempted to examine them, but the result was so absurd that I was obliged to give it up. A total ignorance of the Bible and of arithmetic, mis-spelling and blunders of every conceivable sort, characterised their examination papers. Being ignorant of the art of controlling and disciplining children, the teachers sometimes resorted to cruel punishment to maintain their authority. I remember that in one school the master said that he could not keep the boys in order, though he had broken several sticks on them. In another the children apparently read fluently, but on examining their books I found that many were held upside down. The children could not read at all, but had been taught to repeat certain sentences and to hold their books before them as if they were reading, and thus visitors were made to believe that the children were well instructed in reading. In numerous instances I find by reference to my notes, that I had to recommend the instant dismissal of teachers for gross inefficiency, cruelty, or immorality."

It is not surprising, then, to find the larger Unions beginning to move in the matter. In 1841 a deputation of the Manchester Board of Guardians visited Norwood and came back with a glowing account of Mr. Aubin's establishment,[3] and by 1843 the Guardians of the Manchester and the Sheffield Unions and also the Select Vestry of Liverpool had decided upon establishing separate schools for their pauper children.[4]

It must be observed here that up to 1842 it was a disputed point whether the Commissioners had any control over parishes governed by local Acts. A decision of that year settled the point in their favour, and the consequence was that they proceeded forthwith to make an inquiry as to the way in which the Poor Law was administered in these parishes. An idea of the way in which pauper

[1] See 6 *P. L. C.*, p. 176. The letter is especially interesting, too, as showing that under good management a workhouse education could show satisfactory results as early as 1840. Out of twenty-two children sent out to service from that workhouse in 1839 only two had returned there, one of them under circumstances over which the child had no control. The Atcham Workhouse school afforded another example of what could be done in such an institution with good administration. See *post*, p. 15.
[2] 20 *P. L. B.*, p. 129.
[3] 7 *P. L. C.*, p. 237.
[4] 9 *P. L. C.*, p. 18.

children were dealt with in some of them will be given by the following examples.

The schoolmaster of the Salisbury workhouse was found to be a pauper whose reduced circumstances were attributable to the habit of drinking to excess, while the schoolmistress could not write.[1] At Coventry the girls were under the care of a female pauper who was not a scholar, and who had not taught them spelling or reading or anything else. At Shrewsbury there was no schoolmaster or schoolmistress, and no attempt at classification nor any attention paid to the moral training of the children.[2] At Oswestry and Chester both schoolmaster and schoolmistress were paupers.[3] At Southampton the schoolmaster was an aged man whose sense of hearing was almost gone. The boys could not make him hear without raising their voices to a painful pitch, and in consequence paid little attention to him. They were not instructed in work of any kind. The schoolmistress, who had been a pauper, could only read a little and not write at all. By an order of the Guardians of this town the master of the workhouse was authorised "to flog all boys who shall go off the premises without leave, and *leg them by the leg*, and keep them upon bread and water for a week for each offence."[4] In some of the parishes, on the other hand, the state of things was much better, and in Kingston-upon-Hull, Bristol, and Birmingham, the children were educated in separate schools, while in Whitchurch (Salop) and Canterbury they attended the National Schools.

Where necessary the Commissioners issued their workhouse rules to these incorporations, for as yet no General Order on the subject had been made.

We have referred to the mode of apprenticing pauper children in vogue at the time of the reform of 1834. Masters could, under 8 and 9 Will. III. ch. 30, be *compelled* to receive and provide for them from the age of nine to twenty-one years. The mischievous operation of this system was exposed in various reports of the Sub-Commissioners,[5] but it was not till 1844 that it was abolished.[6] By that Act pauper children could only be bound apprentices to persons willing to take

[1] 9 *P. L. C.*, p. 137. [2] *Ibid.*, p. 309. [3] *Ibid.*, p. 309.

[4] 10 *P. L. C.*, pp. 171, 173. "Logging by the leg" was effected by means of wooden clogs chained to the walls, these clogs being fastened to the legs of the boys.

[5] See especially Mr. Gilbert's Report, 2 *P. L. C.*, pp. 343-350; Mr. Head's Report, *Ibid.*, pp. 403-407; Mr. Tufnell's Report, 3 *P. L. C.*, p. 151; Dr. Kay's Report, 4 *P. L. C.*, pp. 233, 234; Mr. Kay Shuttleworth's Report on the Training of Pauper Children contained in the Report of the Poor Law Commissioners to the Earl of Normanby, 1841, App., pp. 127-194.

[6] 7 & 8 Vict. ch. 101, s. 13.

them, and the power of overseers to bind or assign apprentices in districts where there was a Board of Guardians was taken away and transferred to the Guardians. Under this Act the Poor Law Commissioners were enabled to make regulations in regard to apprenticeship, and the first three General Orders on the subject were issued in 1845.[1] Some parishes and Unions objected strongly to the impediments placed in the way of apprenticeship by the Orders, more especially as to (1) the limitations upon premiums for apprentices above the age of fourteen,[2] (2) the payment to be made by the master after they had reached the age of seventeen,[3] and (3) the prohibition against their being taken more than ten miles from the place of apprenticeship without the licence of the Guardians.[4]

The intention of the Commissioners was, of course, to discourage the apprenticeship of parish children. "We should not regret to find," they said, "that the regulations imposed by us tended gradually to diminish the number of children thus dealt with. We feel satisfied that greater attention to the education and industrial training of poor children would more than compensate for any supposed inconvenience arising from an indisposition to take apprentices, and that the results of such an improvement would be beneficial both to the master and the child."[5] Being, however, unwilling "to inflict any great or sudden inconvenience on large and populous parishes,"[6] they yielded to the insistence of the Guardians and amended the General Orders, (1) by allowing a premium other than clothing to be given upon the binding as an apprentice of any person not above the age of sixteen years, (2) by allowing the Guardians to dispense with the condition

[1] See 11 *P. L. C.*, App. A., pp. 72-96.

[2] Art. 2. "No premium other than clothing for the apprentice shall be given upon the binding of any person above the age of fourteen, unless such person be maimed, deformed, or suffering from some permanent bodily infirmity, so that the nature of the work or trade which such person is fit to perform or exercise is restricted."

[3] Art. 18 (8). "Where the apprentice continues bound after the age of *seventeen* years the master shall pay to such apprentice for and in respect of every week that he duly and properly serves the said master, as a remuneration, a sum to be inserted in the indenture or to be agreed upon by the Guardians and the said master when that time arrives, or, if they cannot agree, to be settled by some person to be then chosen by the said master and the said Guardians; and until such sum be agreed upon or settled, not less than *one-fourth* of the amount then commonly paid as wages to journeymen in the said trade, or business, or employment."

[4] Art. 18 (10). "The master shall not cause the said apprentice to work or live more than *ten miles* from the place or places mentioned in the indenture, according to Article 16, without the leave of the Guardians so binding him, to be given under their common seal."

[5] 11 *P. L. C.*, p. 16. [6] *Ibid.*, p. 17.

in the indenture providing for the payment of the remuneration to the apprentice after the age of seventeen years, and (3) by providing that the Guardians might authorise the master to change the place of the abode or service of the apprentice without any application to them.[1]

By the General Order of the 24th July, 1847, the regulations then in force were made permanent, and they have not been altered since.[2] In 1854 they were applied to cases of apprenticeship to the sea service.[3]

But the year 1844 was not only rendered memorable in Poor Law history by the abolition of the old apprenticeship system, but also by the power given to the Commissioners by the same Act to provide, with the consent of the Guardians, for the establishment of district schools.[4] This Act repealed Jonas Hanway's Acts,[5] and relieved the Metropolitan parishes from the necessity of sending their young children into the country for nurture and maintenance, it being thought that the district schools would replace the private establishments.[6] But, as the Act provided that no part of the district should be distant more than fifteen miles from any other part, the formation of school districts in the rural portions of the country was practically prohibited. This limitation was removed by an Act of 1848,[7] and the consent of the Guardians of the several Unions wishing to combine was then only required for the formation of such districts. Section fifty-one of the same Act enabled the Guardians of parishes or Unions, the limits of whose boundaries were within twenty miles of a district school, to send their children there with the consent of the managers, and a later Act of 1851 (14 & 15 Vict. ch. 105, s. 6) enabled them

[1] See General Orders of 1846. 12 *P. L. C.*, pp. 60–71.

[2] See *post*, p. 267, for an abstract of the present regulations.

[3] See 17 & 18 Vict. ch. 104, ss. 141–4. This Act has been repealed and replaced by the Merchant Shipping Act, 1894, sections 105–109 of which now regulate this kind of apprenticeship. See *post*, pp. 273, 274.

[4] 7 & 8 Vict. ch. 101, s. 40.

[5] 2 Geo. III. ch. 22, and 7 Geo. III. ch. 39. See *ante*, p. 3.

[6] Up to 1849 these private establishments were outside the control of the Central Poor Law Authority. By an Act of that year (12 & 13 Vict. ch. 13) the Poor Law Board was empowered to cause them to be inspected, to issue rules for their government as if they were workhouses, to remove unfit officers and servants, and to regulate the contracts between the parochial authorities and the proprietors. The practice of farming out the poor had before this year become very limited in its operation, so that only three contractors' establishments were then existing, viz., one at Brixton, which was only used for a few of the poor of Newington Parish, and two at Margate for scrofulous cases. See 2 *P. L. B.*, pp. 16, 17. The Brixton establishment was given up in 1851.

[7] 11 & 12 Vict. ch. 32.

under the same limit as to distance to send their children to the workhouses or buildings of other Unions or parishes.

We have already referred to Dr. Kay's arguments in favour of district schools.[1] The opinion of the Poor Law Commissioners is well expressed in the following extract from their Report of the 31st December, 1837, (p. 34), on the further amendment of the Poor Laws:

"An investigation of the circumstances of the children in the several workhouses, and of the means of affording them adequate instruction, soon convinced us that the instruction of pauper children must remain imperfect so long as the pauper children of each Union are reared in the workhouse belonging to the Union. The number of children of both sexes in each workhouse rarely exceeds fifty or sixty, and sometimes does not amount to more than twenty or thirty. So small a number of children cannot be advantageously distributed into classes for the purpose of instruction, nor are they of sufficient importance to induce the ratepayers to incur the expenses requisite for providing them with competent teachers. Moreover, the number of teachers is unnecessarily augmented, and the difficulty of procuring them increased by establishing a school for pauper children in every workhouse. The inspection of the schools for pauper children is likewise rendered more difficult by the multiplication of their number, which results from the present system. These considerations (together with others to which we need not here advert) show the expediency of congregating pauper children into large bodies for the purposes of education."

Not only was it expected that a much more efficient system of instruction and training might be adopted, but that there would be a saving of expense arising from the reduced number of schoolmasters and schoolmistresses, and from a similar reduction in the provision of books, furniture, etc.

It is an interesting fact, however, that in 1861, when the Education Commission of 1859 issued its report, *i.e.*, seventeen years after the passing of the Act authorising the establishment of district schools, and in spite of the constant 'pushing' of the Poor Law Board,[2] only six districts had been formed, three in London and three in the country, and these six had been formed so far back as 1849.[3] That

[1] *Ante*, p. 6.

[2] *e.g.*, 1 *P. L. B.*, p. 7; 5 *P. L. B.*, p. 8; 8 *P. L. B.*, p. 9; 11 *P. L. B.*, p. 16. In the light of the recent Metropolitan Poor Law Schools Report, 1896, it is curious that in 1852 the Poor Law Board should especially note "the healthy, animated tone which pervades the children, both as respects body and mind; the improvement in their physiognomy and bearing is too striking to be overlooked, and it is especially gratifying to add that a corresponding amelioration in their moral character has been simultaneously produced." (5 *P. L. B.*, p. 8.)

[3] Viz., Central London, Farnham and Hartley Wintney, North Surrey, Reading

ission was so impressed with the [illegible] of [illegible], ecommended their *compulsory* establishment. Naturally, they not foresee the drawbacks to which the experience of years has these schools to be subject. It is the fashion nowadays to Guardians all round, but it should not be forgotten that had it en for their passive but dogged resistance, the country would ve some 100 district 'barrack' schools to deal with, instead of ten, of which six belong to Metropolitan Unions.

objections to the establishment of district schools in country s are well set out in a letter from a gentleman of "great nce in Poor Law Administration," from which Mr. Doyle, in port of 31st December, 1850, to the Poor Law Board, quotes as :

a district containing an area of over 150 square miles, only cent. of the children who become chargeable were under the of the Guardians for more than a very limited and uncertain The numbers in different Unions may vary considerably, but is carefully administered I am convinced that the total number ldren required to keep up a separate institution with success *for ildren over whom the Guardians have undivided control* must in istricts be collected from an area which will entirely subvert the bject in view by preventing education altogether, so far as the extremities of districts formed, besides which the interest the distant parts of the district and the institution will be so as to militate very seriously against the inmates. This, of would not occur in the large towns and more populous parts ral counties, where the districts for this purpose might be of te size; but supposing the existence of such institutions, it will ent that the present, or some modified system of Union schools, e maintained for the nine-tenths of the children, who, being with their parents, are probably not two months on the under the control of the Guardians. As, therefore, such must continue (or no education be afforded to the great bulk hildren), I think that, independent of expense, the removal of ans, etc., would tend very much to injure the existing schools, ld therefore be objectionable in practice."[1]

eir General Order of the 24th July, 1847, the Poor Law Com- rs added arithmetic to the subjects which were to be taught er children, and ordered that besides their being trained to

ngham, South East Shropshire, and South Metropolitan. These districts rmed in 1849, the managers of the Central London School District having Mr. Aubin's establishment at Norwood (see *ante*, p. 6), appointing him intendent of the School. (See 2 *P. L. B.*, p. 14.) The regulations for pement of the Central London School are set out in 2 *P. L. B.*, App.,

n of 5th August, 1851 (No. 646), to the House of Commons, p. 4.

habits of usefulness, industry, and virtue, such other instruction should be imparted to them as might fit them for service.[1]

With a view of further improving the efficiency of the instruction given to children in the workhouse, Parliament, in 1846, voted the sum of £15,000 towards the payment of the teachers' salaries, but the continuation of the grant was to depend on their efficiency. At the same time the Government expressed its intention of appointing separate inspectors of workhouse schools, who were to be under the control of the Committee of Council of Education.[2] So early as 1848 the Commissioners were able to report that the influence of this grant was already beginning to be felt, and that it had enabled them to press upon the Guardians with success many improvements in the management of schools, and in the instruction of the children educated in them.[3]

One of the first actions of the Poor Law Board, as the successors of the Poor Law Commissioners, was to issue a circular to Boards of Guardians on the subject of this grant.[4] In this circular they state that "the whole of the salaries of the schoolmasters and schoolmistresses of workhouses became charged on this fund from the 1st October, 1846; since which time masters and mistresses have, in several instances, been appointed where no such officers existed previously, and in other cases inefficient officers have been superseded by persons who had been trained and fitted for their duties. No comprehensive effort has, however, hitherto been made to introduce any system for raising the general standard of the qualification of this class of officers. The proper education and training of children in the workhouses are essential to the improvement of their condition, as well as highly important with reference to the social condition of the working classes generally, and the increasing of the efficiency of workhouse schools must therefore always be an object of much solicitude with the Board." With the view of effecting this object the Board adopted a proposal for the examination of the schoolmasters and schoolmistresses in the several workhouses by inspectors appointed by the Committee of Council, and for the appropriation according to certain scales of efficiency, thus ascertained, of the grant voted by Parliament for the repayment of the salaries of these officers, so that larger sums would be granted to those Boards of Guardians which had efficient schoolmasters and schoolmistresses than to those whose officers possessed inferior qualifications.[5]

[1] Art. 114. By the General Order of the 3rd April, 1878, the standard of education was to be thenceforth the same as that prescribed by the Education Code. See *post*, p. 40. [2] 13 *P. L. C.*, p. 27. [3] 14 *P. L. C.*, p. 5. [4] 1 *P. L. B.*, p. 22. [5] 1 *P. L. B.*, p. 6. As to how the system worked see 2 *P. L. B.*, pp. 12, 13.

Board also, with the assistance (C of C
ble to help the Guardians in getting useful school books and
apparatus for the workhouse schools;[1] and the result was
me schools which were scantily supplied with them and other
where books of an unsuitable character were used, became
nished with the books and maps best adapted for the purposes
ular education.[2]

as about this time that the pupil teacher system established
Committee of Council of Education in 1846 began beneficially
t workhouse schools, as it had already done in the case of
mal schools. It came about in this way: "Many of the pupil
s, on the expiration of their apprenticeships at about the age
teen, had not sufficient funds to pay their expenses in
schools, and found it necessary to turn their talents to
ate account. The workhouse schools offered fair salaries,
e board and lodging, while the number of children was rarely
han thirty and forty to each school. The ex-pupil teachers
actly fitted for these schools. They had had five years of
; their knowledge had been tested through public examina-
a Government officer every year of their apprenticeship; and
d been accustomed to the management of children. Hence
re infinitely superior in every sense to the old class of teacher."
fnell tells us that from the time the services of this class
available (1850) he observed that the small workhouse schools
d materially.[3]

satisfactory to find that the importance of affording to the
in Union workhouses such an education as might best tend
them from the class of paupers to that of independent
s and artisans was now becoming more and more felt by
of Guardians.[4] A very interesting return made to the House
mons in 1851[5] shows this very clearly. In many Unions
dren were found to be receiving an education beyond all
son better than that which was within the reach of the children

L. B., p. 6. [2] 2 *P. L. B.*, p. 13.
L. B., pp. 129, 130. Mr. Tufnell shows how the action of the revised
minished the number of these pupil teachers, and how few at the time
(1867) were the applications for the post of teachers in workhouse schools
with what they had been before the revised Code came into force. *Ibid.*,

P. L. B., p. 9; 7 *P. L. B.*, pp. 8, 9; 11 *P. L. B.*, p. 14.
eturn comprises three reports made to the Poor Law Board by their
—Mr. Doyle, Mr. Farnall, and Sir John Walsham—on the education and
f pauper children in their respective districts in the year 1850.

of labourers in any part of the country.[1] The only difficulty was in finding competent teachers. Mr. Bowyer, one of H.M.'s Inspectors of workhouse schools, wrote:

"It is impossible, while viewing a really good and moral workhouse school, not to be impressed with the conviction that few among these children will sink into the degraded condition of paupers, or even into the dull and spiritless peasantry which at seasons of distress crowd the lobby of the Board rooms." (pp. 6–7.)

What can be done to make even a workhouse school efficient and depauperizing, is well shown by a letter written in 1850 from Mr. Everest, the clerk of the Atcham Board of Guardians, to Mr. Doyle.[2]

In this letter Mr. Everest showed how conscious he was of the difficulties to be contended with in a workhouse school. He did not, however, consider them to be insurmountable, nor really formidable. Indeed, only a moderate amount of attention was necessary from any intelligent Board of Guardians with active conscientious officers to place their school in a few months on the most satisfactory footing. He then proceeds to describe from his own fourteen years' experience of the Atcham Workhouse school how the children of the poor could be efficiently taught in such schools and made useful and honourable members of society.

"At first, the number of children was small, the Guardians feeling it desirable not to crowd their workhouse until time had afforded all parties concerned in its government a little practical experience therein. A school was at once established, but as no qualified schoolmaster applied in answer to an advertisement for such an officer, the situation was taken by a person who, though deficient in mental acquirements for such an office, was a practical agriculturist, of good moral character, and entered on his duties with a determination to do all that he could for the welfare of the children put under his care. The first step was that of making the school a place of moral as well as physical training, to which I attribute its great success. For this purpose everything that transpired was to the extent of his ability made the subject of some practical and familiar observations, enforced by such illustrations as became weighty by example. Industry was from the first a marked characteristic of the school, to inculcate which various indoor occupations were, and still are, practised, such as knitting, netting, plaiting straw, etc., by which means it became a natural habit in the children to be doing something that was useful; so that when, fatigued with heavier toils, the child sat down to rest, it was, I had almost said, an instinctive feeling that led him to take his straws or needle in hand. And yet

[1] Return, pp. 4, 26. See also the account of the Guiltcross Union, Norfolk, *ibid.*, pp. 44–53. [2] *Ibid.*, pp. 12–15.

gratification afforded when he he a
the pleasure evinced when
formed, proved that his mind had received a correct bias as to
duction by his own application. Nor was there ever occasion
enforce this practice when once begun, as it became a source
pleasure to be so engaged."

The punishment of a lazy boy was simple and effective. He wa
en away from his work to look at the others busily employed, with
result that in almost every case the boy asked for liberty to g
work again. It often happened, too, that the other boys, instead
making any taunting remarks, became petitioners on behalf o
ir school-fellow.

"These may appear trifling incidents, but let Guardians and Officers
the plan and watch the issue in future service, and they will find,
I have done, that they are important facts; and I notice them
cause for the want of seeing this important fact at the outset, tha
child is to be trained to the principle of being useful, so much o
other efforts are vain.

"Another important point we have always aimed at has been to
ch the child to do his work well, to do that work in the right way,
nd then to make him understand why that particular way is best, and
is gives them additional interest in their work, while it tends to make
hem good workmen in after life."

A portion of the land belonging to the workhouse was cultivated exclusively by the boys, and it was found by experience that, with eighteen or twenty boys above nine years of age and not exceeding fourteen years, from two to three acres of land was requisite for school cultivation, and that this land should be kept exclusively for that purpose, no adult pauper being allowed to enter thereon.

Mr. Everest also recommended the keeping of pigs, to be attended to by the children under the direction of the masters; but although he knew that some persons strongly advocated a nearer approach to farming by an extension of land, the keeping of cows, etc., his experience was that wherever this plan had been tried it had failed. He then goes on to say:

"Having stated the nature and practice of our school for fourteen years, it only remains to speak of its success. It has been said that the tendency of workhouse schools is to make perpetual paupers, and such statements are made, no doubt, in the full belief of their truth, but I am happy to say that, so far as fourteen years may serve for the data of calculation, it is without the shadow of a foundation here. Our children go to service, and I would rather refer inquirers to their employers for their characters as servants than speak of it myself. Suffice it to say that, with a very few exceptions (and those of characters

the most vicious and thoroughly formed before they came to us), and one or two cases of serious illness, they have not returned, except, as is frequently the case, to visit the school where they were trained in the habits of virtue and industry, and leave behind them some trifle, either in money or otherwise, to the school fund. If we trained them up as paupers, I think many of them bid fair to forget the place of their training before they return. Scarcely a child who has been taught in our schools leaves it without those feelings of affection which indicate most clearly that the mind has been cultivated, and the assistance they afford in procuring situations for those they left behind proves the genuine character of their attachments; but to return to the workhouse after going to service is felt to be a disgrace, and will, I hope, as it has hitherto done, prevent such a circumstance ever occurring except in cases that are unavoidable; and in such cases I hope that a sense of rectitude and the love of virtue will seek such an asylum in preference to crime." (pp. 12–14.)

In a postscript to his letter, Mr. Everest gives the names of twenty-seven children sent to service (fourteen boys and thirteen girls) between 1843 and 1848. All except two of the girls were doing well.

Again, as to the Ludlow Union, Mr. Doyle reports that the girls' school in the workhouse was better managed than in any other Union in his district. He says:[1]

"The children are under the care of a very efficient schoolmistress, aided by an assistant who superintends the industrial education of the girls; they are habitually trained in habits of useful industry proper to their station. The classification in the workhouse is so perfect that the children are brought up almost as much apart from adults as if they were in a separate school. The whole of the girls who come into the workhouse enjoy the advantages of this admirable training. When it is remembered that the fluctuation of children in this workhouse is 27 per cent., it will be obvious how desirable it is to preserve a good school in the workhouse of this Union." As to the boys in this workhouse, he says: "It is true that no considerable machinery exists for the industrial training of the boys, but the number of boys capable of working seldom exceeds six or eight. The highest number at any one time of boys above nine years of age during the past year was fifteen; the lowest number was seven. Of the boys above nine who were in the workhouse on the 1st December, 1849, 50 per cent. had left the workhouse between that day and the 1st December, 1850. In a letter from the master of the workhouse now before me, he says: 'The boys are well able to cultivate the garden by digging, planting, etc. They always leave us at an early age, as we seldom have a boy above the age of twelve; they seldom or never return, and we have many pleasing instances where our boys are growing to young men, and conducting themselves most creditably, enjoying the confidence and esteem of their masters. Even now we have demands for boys which the Guardians cannot comply with.'"

[1] Return, pp. 22, 23.

The return contains a great deal of additional evidence as to the success in after life of the children brought up in good workhouse schools. Thus the clerk of one Union wrote to Mr. Doyle as follows:[1]

"Clergymen, farmers of high reputation, manufacturers, professional gentlemen, and tradesmen, have applied for and taken children from our workhouse as servants. To these I would confidently appeal as to the character of the children brought up here. I can state that those who have taken one child generally apply for more, as vacancies occur in their establishments, and I can refer to persons who, having kept these children for several years, until they became older than was required for the situation they had to fill, have kept them on until they could secure for them situations suited to their advanced age and worth."

Mr. Doyle concludes his very interesting Report as follows:[2]

"In considering the state of pauper education, and what may be done to improve it, the fact of the fluctuating class of children dealt with must not be lost sight of." . . . "Nor should it be forgotten that the effect of the distribution of the Parliamentary grant for the payment of the salaries of teachers is only just now beginning to be felt. There are, indeed, many Unions for the schools of which the Guardians are yet unable to find qualified teachers. Taking into consideration these difficulties, some of them accidental and temporary, but the most formidable inherent in the subject, I cannot but think that the actual state of pauper education in this district may be regarded as being satisfactory and the future as reasonably hopeful." (p. 37.)

It is clear, then, that even in 1850 something more than the mere three R's was being taught to pauper children. In many cases the boys were being employed in agricultural occupations, and the Guardians had provided land for the purpose. Mr. Farnall reported[3] that in his district nineteen out of the fifty-three Unions had provided land, in the cultivation of which 514 boys were employed. Nor did their mental training suffer, for Mr. Bowyer reported that the introduction of agricultural training had been everywhere attended by a marked improvement in their appearance and bodily vigour; and their progress in their studies, so far from being retarded by it, had been generally promoted, notwithstanding the reduction in the number of hours devoted to school instruction.[4]

In 1851 the Poor Law Board reported that the workhouse schools were still increasing in efficiency, especially in the matter of industrial training.[5] In this year, too, a useful Act (14 & 15 Vict. ch. 105, s. 6) was passed, enabling the Guardians of Unions who had more accommodation than they wanted for maintaining and instructing their own children to take in the children of other Unions.

[1] Return, pp. 9-10. [2] *Ibid.*, p. 37. [3] *Ibid.*, pp. 40-43.
[4] 3 *P. L. B.*, p. 8. [5] 4 *P. L. B.*, p. 7.

Another Act (18 & 19 Vict. ch. 34), passed in 1855,[1] enabled the Guardians to pay out of the rates for the education of the children of outdoor paupers, although they could not impose as a condition of such relief that the education should be given.[2] About this time, too, Boards of Guardians began more generally to provide for their indoor pauper children by means of schools separate from the workhouse. This system had been especially developed in London since the use of the contractors' establishments was given up.[3] Mr. Farnall reported, in 1858, upon this subject as follows:[4]

"There are usually 8900 children in the workhouses and several detached schools of the Metropolitan District, and of this number 3700 are found in workhouses, and 5200 in separate or district schools. Of the above 8900 children 6900, or 77½ per cent., are receiving education, the remainder being principally infants. Their education consists of moral, mental, and industrial training, and 3235 of them are being trained in industry.

"The branches of industry taught are carpentering, tailoring, the nature and use of a steam engine, shoemaking, spade labour, music to fit boys for the bands of the army and navy, cooking, baking, sewing, dairy work, laundry work, and house work; and there are 2700 children in separate or district schools, under efficient instructors, receiving in their respective classes this kind of training.

"The management of separate and district schools is, in my opinion, on the whole, on a satisfactory footing. As some evidence of this, I may refer to the fact that 846 children attended the South Metropolitan District School during the year ended Christmas, 1858, that of these 183 went out to service, twenty-seven of them returned from their situations on account of sickness and other causes over which they had no control, while four only lost their situations during the year through their own misconduct.

"I believe that the industrial training of the separate and district schools still admits of improvement, and I know that the managers are very closely attending to this important subject."

Mr. Pigott also reported as follows in the same year on the separate school of the Oxford Guardians, at Cowley, and on the Reading and Wokingham District School:[5]

"The schools at Cowley now seem to be well conducted. The weekly cost for food and clothing does not exceed 2*s.* 5*d.* per head, about 3½*d.* of which is derived from the farm of seven acres. Eight of the boys are regularly taught tailor's and shoemaker's work. The

[1] Known as Denison's Act.
[2] Education in such cases was not made a condition of outdoor relief till 1873 (see 36 & 37 Vict. ch. 86, s. 3). [3] 9 *P. L. B.*, pp. 7, 117.
[4] 11 *P. L. B.*, p. 14. See also 12 *P. L. B.*, p. 18. [5] 11 *P. L. B.*, p. 15.

remainder work in the field. The children get very readily out to good service.

"I am glad to be able to report the same prosperous condition of the Reading and Wokingham District School, that has existed since the appointment of the present superintendent and matron, and which is to be mainly, if not entirely, attributed to their excellent management of the children and establishment. Indeed, I consider its success as a pauper educational establishment to be complete, notwithstanding many disadvantages of locality, and in the arrangement and position of the buildings. The children are healthy, intelligent, well conducted, and cheerful. Their progress in the ordinary school instruction is on a level with that of the best workhouse schools. A certain number are regularly taught tailor's and shoemaker's work; but the principal occupation of the boys is the cultivation of ten acres of light, fertile land, with the tending of three cows and a number of pigs, by means of which they become healthy and strong, and fit for useful service; and, moreover, the profit from their labour has enabled the managers to reduce the cost of each child for food and clothing from 3*s.* 8*d.* to 2*s.* 4*d.* per week, and thus to effect a saving (on the average of 150 children in the school) of about £500 per annum. The total number of children in the school at this time is 143—seventy-two girls and seventy-one boys. The system pursued with the girls is equally judicious. They perform (with the aid of the cook and the laundry maid) all the household duties, and get readily into respectable service."

(2) The Period from 1861 to 1874.

In 1861 the Report of the Royal Commission on Education appeared. In this report the respective advantages of district and separate schools are weighed against those of workhouse schools, and as we have already said (*ante*, p. 12), the decision was not only given in favour of the former, but the report was most thorough-going in its denunciations of the latter. It had hardly one good word for them. This is the more surprising in the light of the Reports of the Poor Law Board, and of the satisfactory results of many of the workhouse schools.[1] We have already given examples (*ante*, pp. 15–18), but will add one more. In 1858 the Leicester Board of Guardians ordered a return to be prepared by their Clerk of the number of boys and girls who, during the two previous years, had left the workhouse for domestic service or to be apprenticed, showing, as far as practicable, how they had conducted themselves and their then position. It appears that during that period fourteen boys were apprenticed and fifteen girls went into service. Of the boys twelve were doing well, and of the girls two had been returned to the workhouse and four lost sight of, having

[1] It is not surprising, however, if Mr. Andrew Doyle's criticism of the report was accurate, as we have every reason to believe was the case. See *post*, p. 22.

left their first places; but not one of the girls had fallen, so far as was known, into vice or crime, or had been returned to the workhouse for any stain upon their moral character.[1] Such examples show that even a workhouse school could be made efficient and to produce good results. But it does not seem to have occurred to the Royal Commission that bad administration was at the bottom of the evils which they described, and that whatever system was adopted it would depend for its success or failure upon those who had to administer it. Expert opinion was then all in favour of large schools, and the Commission could scarcely have been expected not to have been influenced by it. They held that the evidence they had taken established the following propositions:[2]

1. That pauperism is hereditary, and that the children born and bred as members of that class furnish the great mass of the pauper and criminal population.

2. That the best prospect of a permanent diminution of pauperism and crime is to be found in the proper education of such children.

3. That district and separate schools give an education to the children contained in them, which effectually tends to emancipate them from pauperism.

4. That the workhouse schools are generally so managed that the children contained in them learn from infancy to regard the workhouses as their homes, and associate with grown-up paupers whose influence destroys their moral character and prevents the growth of a spirit of independence.

5. That the arrangements of workhouses are unavoidably such as to make it extremely difficult to procure or to retain competent teachers.

From these premises they came to the conclusion that the only means of improving the condition of pauper education was to compel by law the general establishment of district and separate schools.[3]

As to the fourth proposition, it contradicts two Parliamentary returns of the year 1861. One return[4] gave the number of children who were for a period of not less than two consecutive years, within the ten years ending December 31st, 1860, in the workhouses and district schools of England and Wales, and who left them for service or other industrial occupation; the number of such children who returned to the workhouse by reason of their own misconduct; and the number

[1] 11 *P. L. B.*, p. 36.
[2] Report, p. 385.
[3] Report, vol. i. pp. 384, 385.
[4] No. 496, 29th July, 1861.

who returned from causes not involving their own misconduct. Omitting the district schools,[1] the following were the totals:

Number of boys	14,933
Number of girls	13,418
Number of boys returned on account of misconduct	856 (or 5·7%)
,, ,, girls ,, ,, ,, ,,	1693 (or 12·6%)
,, ,, boys who returned from other causes .	1296 (or 8·6%)
,, ,, girls ,, ,, ,, ,,	1791 (or 13·3%)

Mr. Bowyer in his Report for 1871[2] justly considered these statistics by no means unsatisfactory, especially when it was noted that the return did not (1) state how long the children who returned to the workhouse remained there; nor (2) state what proportion of the children had been in the schools for only two years, and who, therefore, could not have had time to benefit by the education and training given; nor (3) give any definition of the word "misconduct," which might include any juvenile or petty offence.

The other return[3] showed that out of 14,216 persons who had been inmates of workhouses for five years at least, only 552 could be traced as having been brought up in a workhouse school. Mr. Bowyer carefully looked up those 552 cases, and was unable to find more than two persons who returned to the workhouse in consequence of any moral fault, the cause of the return being, in most instances, mental or bodily infirmity.[4]

So conflicting, indeed, was the testimony as to pauper education and workhouse schools at this time that the Poor Law Inspectors were directed in 1862 to make an inquiry into the subject, and with special reference to the effect of this education and training upon the conduct and career of the children. The following extract from the Report of Mr. Andrew Doyle is important, not only as showing how the Commission arrived at its conclusions, but also because its criticisms are so applicable to the Report of a certain Departmental Committee issued thirty-five years later. Mr. Doyle says:[5]

"Having examined those parts of the Report of the Education Commission to which you have more particularly directed my attention, *I cannot help expressing my surprise and regret that upon such insufficient grounds the Commissioners should have published so sweeping a condemnation of the whole system of pauper education. It appears to me that the inquiry, as conducted by the Commissioners, was unfairly restricted; that the evidence invited was partial; that the result of this partial evidence is not even impartially presented in the Report, and that the conclusions founded upon investigation so imperfect are inconsistent with the facts of the actual condition of pauper education throughout the kingdom.* In the very valuable evidence recently given by Mr. Coode before the Committee on Poor Relief, that gentleman truly says that any inquiry into the state of pauper education must necessarily be incomplete unless it embraced not merely an account of its condition before 1847, but also a history of the progress which has been made since that period, at which workhouse schools were first placed under Government inspectors, and a large annual grant made for the payment of workhouse teachers. But the Commissioners do not appear to have thought it necessary to make any attempt to trace the effect of a system which has completely changed the character of workhouse education. *Their 'conclusions,' when they are not merely speculative opinions, are to a great extent founded upon evidence not given before them, but culled from reports published eight, ten, and twelve years ago, and altogether, as Mr. Coode observes, inapplicable to the existing state of workhouse education.* If the inquiry had been limited to ascertain the state of workhouse education in 1850, some of the evidence upon which the Commissioners appear to rely might be not undeserving of consideration.

"The Commissioners received Reports from ten Assistant Commissioners, not one of whom was instructed to inquire into the condition of workhouse education. They received replies to a series of questions circulated amongst persons of both sexes 'interested in popular education in different parts of the country,' but this 'circular of questions,' though addressed to fifty-nine persons, was not addressed to one who was known to be directly connected with the administration of the Poor Laws. They examined twenty-five witnesses, but they did not invite the evidence of a single person connected with the Poor Law Board, or who was known to have had recent experience of Poor Law administration. . . . *Nor, as I have remarked, can it be said that the result of the evidence thus partially collected is even fairly presented in the Report. 'The evidence satisfies us,' say the Commissioners, 'that children cannot be educated in workhouses in a satisfactory manner.' . . . But the Commissioners had before them 'some evidence' from other witnesses to which they do not even allude, for although the evidence satisfies the Commissioners that 'children cannot be educated in workhouses in a satisfactory manner,' 'many of the witnesses whose opinions they invited have come to a different conclusion.'*"

It is material to mention here that the Commission also took evidence in regard to the education of the children of outdoor paupers. Nearly 290,000 children of this class were on the rates on the 1st January, 1859,[1] and as a class they were "in a condition almost as degraded as that of indoor pauper children.[2] These children would not go to school voluntarily, and the parents would not compel them to go.[3]

[1] Mr. Carleton Tufnell, indignant that the return showed the district schools in a very little better light than the workhouse schools as regarded "results," looked upon it as "utterly untrustworthy," and supported his views as ably as usual in his Report for 1871. See 1 *L. G. B.*, pp. 218–223.

[2] 23 *P. L. B.*, pp. 215–216; also *Ibid.*, p. 233.

[3] No. 490, 29th July, 1861.

[4] 23 *P. L. B.*, p. 218.

[5] The *italics* are our own.

[1] Report, p. 380. On the 1st January, 1896, the number of outdoor pauper children was 184,437.

[2] Report, p. 380.

[3] *Ibid.*, p. 384.

As a remedy the Commissioners proposed to make it "compulsory on the Guardians to insist on the education of the child as a condition of outdoor relief to the parent, and to provide such education out of the rates.[1]

A useful Act was passed in 1861 (24 & 25 Vict. ch. 113, subsequently replaced by 29 & 30 Vict. ch. 118) enabling Guardians to contract with the managers of any certified industrial school for the maintenance and education of refractory children; and in the following year another Act (25 & 26 Vict. ch. 43) of still greater utility, enabling them to make use of certified schools for the education and training of special classes of children such as the blind, deaf and dumb, lame, deformed, or idiotic.[2]

In the light of recent proposals it is curious to find that in 1863, *at the desire of the Committee of Council of Education*, the superintendence, inspection and examination of the workhouse and district schools was again placed under the Poor Law Board; no reason is assigned for the change, though probably the Education Department found the work to be more than they could properly perform. It was not intended to alter the conduct of pauper education in any way by the transfer, and the Board said that it would be their earnest desire to provide that a sound and useful education should be imparted to all such children as were dependent upon the poor rates for their maintenance and instruction.[3]

It is satisfactory evidence of the progress made in educating and training Poor Law children to become good citizens that in 1864 the Select Committee on Poor Relief were able to report—"that making reasonable allowance for the low condition, physical, moral, and mental, of a large proportion of the children when they first enter workhouses, and for the necessarily frequent changes in their admission and discharge, the state of workhouse education is upon the whole satisfactory in its character and result." At the same time the Committee reported in favour of district or separate schools, as being attended with beneficial results to the children, and as affording the best means of separating them from other classes of paupers.[4] Again in 1867 the Poor Law Board refer to the reports of its inspectors as giving a favourable account of the state and progress of education and the efficiency of the schools, not only of the district and separate

[1] Report, p. 385. Nothing was done under this recommendation till the Education Act of 1873. In fact, the Select Committee of 1864 on Poor Relief considered the proposal as inconsistent with the principles upon which the relief of the poor is established. See 16 *P. L. B.*, p. 110; and *ante*, p. 19.

[2] On the 1st January, 1895, the number of these schools was 208.

[3] 16 *P. L. B.*, p. 19. [4] *Ibid.*, p. 110.

[illegible] but also of many of the schools in the workhouses.[1] But in [illegible] of the latter schools the number of children was so small as [illegible] to afford sufficient occupation for one teacher, and in these [illegible] the Poor Law Amendment Act of 1866 (29 & 30 Vict. ch. 113, s. 16) was found of use. It repealed the provisions in previous statutes,[2] which limited the distance within which children might be sent to any district school from a Union or parish not combined in the district or from one workhouse to another.

About this time, too, the Poor Law Board gave its consent to some of the oldest and most intelligent boys and girls in large district or separate schools being appointed assistant teachers with small weekly allowances, and when they had attained a sufficient age and experience and had qualified themselves by their attainments to pass the usual examination before School Inspectors and to receive certificates of permission, they were to be entitled to receive such salaries as the certificates would give them according to the usual scale, these salaries to be repayable out of the Parliamentary grant.[3]

In view also of the importance they attached to combining industrial with mental instruction, not only as teaching the boys and girls a trade or occupation by which they might in subsequent years earn a livelihood, but more especially in improving and strengthening their physical as well as their mental faculties, and promoting habits of industry and application, the Board made equitable provision for payments to the Guardians on account of the salaries of industrial instructors in the schools.[4]

But at that time, just as at present, however admirable in its mental effects this industrial training might have been, it does not appear that many of the boys kept to the employment in which they had been instructed.[5]

In 1867 the Metropolitan Poor Act was passed,[6] and as by section 69 the maintenance of pauper children in district, separate, certificated, and licensed schools was made a charge upon the Common Poor Fund established by the Act, it was anticipated that it would give, and it did in fact give, a great impetus to the general adoption in London of the district or separate school systems.

It is in 1868[7] that we hear for the first time of Boards of Guardians applying for leave to board out certain classes of pauper children on the Scotch system. The Poor Law Board expressed their willingness

[1] 19 *P. L. B.*, p. 20.

[2] Viz., 7 & 8 Vict. ch. 101, s. 51; and 14 & 15 Vict. ch. 105, s. 6. See *ante*, pp. 10, 18. [3] *Ibid.* [4] 19 *P. L. B.*, p. 20. [5] *Ibid.*

[6] 30 & 31 Vict. ch. 6. [7] See *post*, p. 28.

to give every facility for a fair trial of the system,[1] and in 1869 directed its inspectors to report upon it so far as it prevailed in their districts, while to Mr. Henley was intrusted a special investigation as to how it was carried out in Scotland and to what classes of children it applied in that country.[2] Mr. Henley reported that children were boarded out in Scotland under the three heads of "orphans," "deserted," and "separated,"[3] and that while he was favourably impressed with the system generally, he was doubtful whether its apparent success in Scotland could be used as an argument for its working with success in England. He pointed to the different habits and modes of life in the working classes of both countries. While Scotland possessed a class of crofters or small occupiers, who were undoubtedly good foster parents, this class was unknown in England, excepting perhaps in Cumberland, Westmoreland, and Durham. The frugal and provident habits of the northern parts of the country were a household word. Education had made the northerner, if not a better man, at least a more intelligent being. Himself educated, he would feel the necessity of forcing his foster charge to school, which Mr. Henley doubted would be the case in England. Then again, Scotland with its large and densely populated cities had drawn largely upon the population sparsely scattered over its pastoral and rural districts, thus leaving an easier opening to the young at the commencement of life than would be found in the more fully-peopled Unions of England. And Mr. Henley warned those who might attempt to introduce this plan of relief that it could only be successful under the following conditions:

(1) Careful selection of nurses, (2) liberal payments, and (3) supervision by paid officers.[4] He said that neglect on any one of these points would ensure failure, and experience has proved him to be right. He said that it would be necessary to lay down the following rules if the system were tried in England:[5]

(i.) The following classes should under no circumstances be boarded out:
- (*a*) Illegitimate children of widows still living.
- (*b*) Other illegitimate children whose mothers are living.
- (*c*) Children deserted by one parent.
- (*d*) Children whose parents are living.

[1] 21 *P. L. B.*, p. 25. The Board had up to then opposed it. *Post*, p. 28.

[2] 22 *P. L. B.*, p. 2. The Reports of the inspectors, together with that of Mr. J. J. Henley on boarding-out in Scotland, are published in a Parliamentary paper (No. 176, Sess. 1870).

[3] "Separated" children are those who have been rescued from profligate parents or evil associations.

[4] *Report of the Inspectors in 1870*, p. 36 (Parliamentary Paper, No. 176).

[5] *Ibid.*, p. 35.

(ii.) Deserted children should not be boarded out till they have been for some time in the workhouse.

(iii.) Children should not usually be boarded with relations.

(iv.) No child should be boarded with a person who is, or otherwise would be, in receipt of parochial relief.

(v.) A child, before it is boarded out, should be passed by the medical officer, and a certificate given that it is in a proper state, mentally and bodily, to be sent out.

(vi.) Not more than two children, except in the case of a family, should be sent to one house.

(vii.) Brothers and sisters should usually be kept together.

(viii.) The sexes should, as far as possible, be separated in the sleeping rooms.

(ix.) Children over seven years of age should not sleep in the same room with married people.

(x.) Children should be boarded out as young as possible.

(xi.) Children should be removed if
- (*a*) They are kept away from school, Sunday-school or Church.
- (*b*) If lodgers are put into the same room with the children.
- (*c*) If children are taken in to board from other Unions or parishes, or
- (*d*) From private people.

(xii.) A periodical return should be obtained from all teachers of schools at which the children attend, stating attendance, conduct, progress, cleanliness (in dress and person), and giving any other information as to the child which may seem necessary.

(xiii.) If any child is sent out to board beyond the boundaries of a Union or parish, immediate notice should be given in writing to the clerk of the Union or parish to which it is sent.

(xiv.) Children should be visited by a paid officer every quarter at least, at uncertain periods; the result of each visit to be entered in a book provided for the purpose, to be placed before the Committee or Guardians at their next meeting.

(xv.) If a Committee should visit the children at the nurses' houses, they should be accompanied by a Medical Officer, who should sign their report or make a separate one.

(xvi.) That the fullest securities should be given for a careful selection of nurses, and for their liberal payment, so as to avoid the employment of the lowest class of persons who would be willing to undertake the duty.

The inquiry as to how far the system prevailed in England and Wales went to show that only twenty-one Unions practised it, and that 347 children were boarded out in these Unions. In one Union (Warminster) the system had been practised for more than twenty years, and in another (Ringwood) for twelve years. In the large majority of cases the state of the children was reported upon as satisfactory, but in several cases the foster parents were receiving out-door relief, and the Report gives some glaring instances of the abuses to which the system is liable,[1] unless very carefully watched over and safeguarded. In the Unions of Highworth and Swindon, where boarding-out had been in operation for six years, all the cases were reported upon as satisfactory, but then the houses were regularly visited and reported upon not only by the Relieving Officers but also by a Committee of the Guardians. In the Chorlton Union the homes and children were supervised by the Relieving Officers and a Ladies' Committee. In the Eton Union, on which Mr. Henley reported, the supervision was exercised by the Relieving Officers and a Committee of the Guardians, but, even under such conditions, this inspector, who was so favourably impressed by the system, was forced by a case which came under his observation to admit the difficulty of enforcing the proper separation of the sexes. He also acknowledged that the system could only be of limited application. In most Unions the children were only visited by the Relieving Officer and by individual Guardians.

The views of the Central Authority at this time upon the subject of boarding-out may be gathered from a letter which the Poor Law Board caused to be sent to the Evesham Board of Guardians in 1869.[2] They admitted that they had hitherto been consistently opposed to the system, "influenced mainly by the consideration that in view of the responsibility imposed upon Guardians as regards orphan children, the Guardians would be unable to exercise the necessary control and supervision of the children who may be removed from the workhouse and placed under the charge of those whose main object in taking the children would be to make a profit out of the sums allowed for their maintenance. Other strong objections occurred to them, such as the difficulty of ensuring that some regular education for the children is given as in the schools attached to the Union. The proposed change appeared to the Board to give insufficient security either for the instruction or the physical well-being of orphan children." But the apparent success of the system in Scotland led them to the conclusion that they ought not to discourage the Guardians from giving it a

[1] *e.g.*, pp. 154, 171, 172. [2] 22 *P. L. B.*, p. 3.

fair trial under certain conditions, viz., (1) that the children must be of such good health as not to miss the constant attendances given to the inmates of the workhouse by the workhouse medical officer; (2) that the foster parents should be in a position to provide them with good wholesome food, warm and cleanly lodging, and the necessary personal inspection; (3) that the children should be sufficiently near schools of the religion to which they belonged as to ensure their regular attendance at them; and (4) that the children should be constantly visited by the Relieving Officers, who were to report frequently on their condition and treatment, and to be held responsible for neglect in doing so.

So far our remarks have only had reference to boarding-out children *within* the Union to which they were chargeable, against which practice no legal impediment existed; an application, however, by Miss Preusser, residing in Westmoreland, to undertake the charge of a certain number of children belonging to the Bethnal Green Union, raised the question of boarding out *without* the Union. Miss Preusser's application was refused on the very good ground that its being acceded to would create a precedent under which the contracts and pecuniary arrangements would not be made direct between the Guardians and those persons who were willing to become the foster parents of the children, but between the Guardians and third parties. The Poor Law Board thought that any approach to arrangements under which third parties would undertake to place out children on behalf of Boards of Guardians was fraught with danger, except under a thoroughly organized system.[1] Further, the Order prohibiting non-resident relief stood in the way. This obstacle was, however, removed by the Boarding-out Order of the following year (1870). In the explanatory memorandum which accompanied the issue of the Order, the Poor Law Board pointed out the advantages which boarding-out seemed to possess over district, separate and workhouse schools. The risks and abuses to which the system was exposed made it necessary that it should only be allowed under certain conditions and regulations. These were laid down in the Order,[2] and need not be set out here. The new Order was largely made use of. Within one year of its being issued thirty Boarding-out Committees had been formed,[3] and at the present time their number exceeds 150. The whole system is now regulated by the two Boarding-out Orders of 1889,[4] a special lady inspector of children boarded out *without* the Unions (Miss Mason) having been appointed in 1885.

[1] 22 *P. L. B.*, p. liv. In the particular case the problem was solved by Miss Preusser taking charge of the children without payment.
[2] *Ibid.*, pp. 18–22. [3] *Ibid.*, p. xlii. [4] See *post*, p. 42.

The Metropolitan Poor Amendment Act of 1869 enabled Boards of Guardians, or the managers of school districts, to acquire, with the consent of the Central Authority, ships for the training of boys for the sea service, and in 1870 the *Goliath* was fitted up in the Thames under the control of the Managers of the Forest Gate School District for the reception of boys from Metropolitan Unions and parishes.[1] The results of this experiment were in all respects satisfactory. A marked and most encouraging improvement had been effected in the physical development and in the bearing and general intelligence of the boys transferred to the ship from Metropolitan Unions. The rapidity with which, since their transfer to the ship, town-bred boys of stunted growth had increased in stature and bulk was most remarkable.[2] The ship was subsequently placed under the management of the Metropolitan Asylum District Board, and boys were received into the ship from Unions and parishes outside the Metropolis.

Upon the burning of the *Goliath* in 1875, it was replaced by the *Exmouth*. There are at the present time only a few training ships in various parts of the country which take pauper boys.[3] These ships are fully described in Chapter IX. They have fortunately been excepted from the general condemnation by the Departmental Committee of the system of aggregating children in large numbers in a single institution.

We have now reached the period when the battle over the education and training of Poor Law children begins to get warm, and it may be well to take stock of the then existing state of things. By 1868 five school districts[4] had been formed in London, and three in the country,[5] only three (one of them dissolved in 1884) having been established since. The children of other London Unions were being educated in large separate schools, but in the country only fifteen Unions had similar separate schools, the large majority of the children being educated in workhouse schools, of which only thirty were detached or separated from the workhouse itself. Boarding-out was,

[1] 22 *P. L. B.*, p. lv.

[2] 1 *L. G. B.*, p. xxvi. It appears, however, that at this time only a very small proportion of the boys could satisfy the regulations of the Royal Navy as to *physique*. (See correspondence on the subject, 1 *L. G. B.*, pp. 237–244.) This is not so now. See *post*, p. 251.

[3] See *post*, p. 252.

[4] Central London, South Metropolitan, North Surrey, West London, and Forest Gate. The Kensington and Chelsea School District was not formed till 1876. The Brentwood School District, formed in 1878, was dissolved in 1884.

[5] Farnham and Hartley Wintney, Reading and Wokingham, and South East Shropshire. The Walsall and West Bromwich District was formed in 1869.

its infancy, and in only seventy Unions were to school. Mr. Carleton Tufnell headed the for district and large schools, and official wavering, still leaned to his side.[1]

Although workhouse schools were admirably managed and showed good results,[2] they had very few defenders. They were to be replaced by boarding-out, nor by sending the children to school outside the workhouse, but by district schools. At the same time, boarding-out was growing into favour, and the practice of sending children to the public elementary schools was becoming more common, and, as the event will show, both these systems were destined not only to put an end to the idea of the universal establishment of district schools, but to bring about the gradual closure of workhouse schools also.

In a circular to Boards of Guardians explanatory of the Boarding-out Order of 1870, the Poor Law Board appraised each system at its just value. They said:[3]

"With regard to the ordinary *workhouse schools* the difficulties are so great that the best efforts of Boards of Guardians to render them efficient are often defeated. Imperfect classification, incomplete separation from the adult inmates, the associations inseparable from the workhouse, and the circumstances that orphans who may be unfortunately thrown out of employment a few years after leaving the workhouse invariably look upon it as their natural home where they have left their friends and acquaintances, the fluctuating terms for which children are admitted, and the smaller competition for the post of schoolmaster and schoolmistress in workhouses as compared with other schools, constitute difficulties of too formidable a character, both in social and educational respects, to justify any preference for the system if any other practice should appear to offer reasonable chances of success.

"On the other hand, the educational and industrial advantages of the district and separate schools, especially in the case of boys, are undeniable, and the Board desire to render full justice to the zeal, ability, and liberality with which many of them have been managed. Indeed, it appears scarcely to admit of a doubt that, as regards the imparting of instruction, they confer a higher degree of education than is likely to be acquired by children boarded out. When permanent and secure employment can be found for boys on leaving these schools, as for instance, in the case of the numerous boys drafted into regimental

[1] See Mr. Tufnell's Reports, 20 *P. L. B.*, p. 128; 22 *P. L. B.*, p. 114. Mr. Bowyer actually proposed so late as 1875 that their establishment should be enforced by the withdrawal of the Parliamentary grant to Boards of Guardians for payment of teachers' salaries. See 22 *P. L. B.*, p. 125; 1 *L. G. B.*, pp. 232–234; and 5 *L. G. B.*, pp. 137–140.

[2] 20 *P. L. B.*, pp. 141, 142, 146, 154. [3] 23 *P. L. B.*, pp. 12, 13.

bands or into the sea service from some of the Metropolitan schools, their success seems complete. But these schools are deficient, especially in the case of girls, from the unavoidable circumstance that no family or domestic ties of any kind are established, and that the children have no other home to fall back upon than the workhouse in the frequent event of troubles befalling them. Besides, they have another disadvantage; orphans and deserted children brought up in pauper schools live there continuously. There is no change from their school life during a part of the year, such as is enjoyed by children brought up in public schools in other spheres of life. The monotony and confinement of pauper schools must necessarily be unbroken, and prevent, to a great extent, the development of many of those faculties of mind and body which, in the case of children who must look forward to a hard industrial life, it is most important to expand. No system of public education can possibly supply the place of that parental care and those home influences of which orphans and deserted children are necessarily deprived. In the district schools, naturally, no attempt of the kind can be made. They aim at and have succeeded in giving the best intellectual and industrial training possible under the circumstances.

"The boarding-out system aims at solving the problem in a different direction, and while inferior as an agency for intellectual education, it may possibly secure many other advantages of a very high order, both to the children themselves and to the community, by replacing the children to a certain extent in that family life from which it is a calamity for them to be entirely excluded. It is further urged in the strongest manner by the advocates of the boarding-out system that it tends to merge the pauper children, to whom it is applied, in the general body of the population; and if this result can be achieved, no more powerful argument can be adduced in favour of the scheme. . . .

"At the same time the Board desire to state that they are fully aware of the risks and abuses to which a system of this nature is necessarily exposed. They are conscious that its success must depend upon the exercise of the utmost caution and diligence on the part of those who are called upon to administer it, and they have accordingly felt it to be incumbent upon them to embody in the Order certain conditions and regulations upon the fulfilment of which the sanction of the Board will be dependent."

One of the defects attending the aggregation of children in large schools, which had evidently not been contemplated by the advocates of the system, was at this time brought into prominence. In 1872 ophthalmia prevailed in several of the Metropolitan schools, and this fact opened the eyes of the Central Authority to the facility with which this or other diseases of a highly infectious character would spread among the large numbers of children congregated in those institutions, unless preventive measures were taken.[1]

[1] 2 *L. G. B.*, p. xxxi. The danger cannot, however, have been unknown to the Board, for, twelve years before, an outbreak of ophthalmia had occurred at Hanwell, and the attention of many eminent oculists had been from time to time called to the subject by the managers of schools, and curative and hygienic measures recommended. See 3 *L. G. B.*, p. xxviii.

A circular was consequently issued to managers and Guardians on the subject,[1] drawing attention to the necessity (1) of immediately removing any child affected by any contagious disease from the body of the schools to the infirmary; (2) of frequent and regular inspections of the children in the schools by the medical officers, so that the removal of any case of sickness which might have escaped the observation of the superintendent and matron might be secured; and (3) of a daily inspection of the children whenever epidemic disease was present in the school.

There can be no doubt that these outbreaks have been caused by the infraction of the regulations of the Central Authority in admitting children suffering from infectious diseases into the schools. At the same time the difficulties under which Boards of Guardians laboured in conforming to these regulations were recognized. Owing to the great pressure upon workhouse accommodation, it had been found practically impossible to carry out the regulations with strictness.

"Of the two alternatives, to detain a sickly child in the over-full sick wards of the workhouse, or to send him insufficiently cured to the school, where at least he would profit by the healthy air and site, the latter has not unfrequently been chosen. And pending the provision of increased and improved infirmary accommodation, it may be plausibly maintained that the choice involved the least of two evils. The result, however, has been that within the last four years[2] a large number of unhealthy children have found an entrance into these schools, and that the difficulty of maintaining a good standard of health has been unusually great."[3]

But by 1874 adequate infirmary accommodation seems to have been obtained in the majority of the workhouses, and the Local Government Board was enabled to secure a stricter observance of their regulations than had up to then been possible.[4] The reports, too, of Dr. Bridges and Dr. Mouatt on ophthalmia in the Metropolitan Poor Law schools,

[1] The letter is dated the 7th December, 1872. 2 *L. G. B.*, p. 54. "The Board consider that it would add greatly to the efficiency of such inspections if the medical officer examined the children weekly, and recorded concisely the result of his examination in writing, for the information of the managers or Guardians as the case might be."

[2] *i.e.*, 1870-74. [3] 3 *L. G. B.*, p. xxix.

[4] For the circulars as to this see 3 *L. G. B.*, p. 2. The managers of the North Surrey Schools at Anerley, which had suffered very severely from an epidemic of ophthalmia in 1872, have been so strict since then as to admitting unhealthy children, that from that time to this only one slight outbreak of the disease, owing to the accidental admission of an infected child to the schools, has occurred. See *post*, p. 123. Also 3 *L. G. B.*, p. xxix; 4 *L. G. B.*, p. 25.

Neath, and Bridgend and Cowbridge.[1] The schools of twenty Unions are now established on this plan, and other Unions are adopting the system.[2]

It was about this time that the practice of sending the children to the public elementary schools rapidly grew into favour. In 1861 only thirty Unions followed it, but in 1874 the number had increased by ninety-eight. Twenty years later the number was 419. The improvement in the education of the country which followed upon the Education Act of 1870 has been so great that Poor Law children get an equally good education to that which could be given them in the workhouse schools, and the saving to the rates is considerable. In 1886 the Board drew special attention to the increase of this practice, but warned Guardians of the absolute necessity of making proper provision for the care of children out of school-hours, and during school-holidays. It seems that in some instances the Guardians were disposed to assign this duty, nominally, to the master and matron, or some other officer, whilst the children were, in fact, to a considerable extent, left to the charge of pauper inmates, which is, of course, a very reprehensible practice.[3]

In their Report for 1876–77 the Local Government Board refer to the inquiries which had been recently made as to the results of the education given in some of the schools. These results were reported as very favourable.[4]

The Elementary Education Act of 1876,[5] which prevented children of between ten and fourteen from being sent to labour unless they had obtained a certificate of proficiency in reading, writing, and arithmetic, was looked upon as likely to produce still more favourable results. The examination for this certificate was at first carried out by the officers of the Education Department in regard to children educated in Poor Law schools, as well as others; but this was found to be inconvenient, and the duty was soon transferred to the Poor Law Educational Inspectors. The great benefit resulting from the

[1] Of these Unions all but West Ham carried out the plans.

[2] The foundation stone of the Chorlton Cottage Homes was laid by Mr. A. J. Balfour, M.P., in August, 1896. The twenty Unions above referred to are Birmingham, Bolton, Bridgend and Cowbridge, Burnley, Chelsea, Christchurch, Dewsbury, Elham, Kensington, King's Norton, Leicester, Neath, Pontypool, Pontypridd, Shoreditch, Swansea, Warrington, West Derby, Wolverhampton, and Worcester. An interesting Report on the Birmingham Cottage Homes at Marston Green will be found in 11 *L. G. B.*, p. xliii.

[3] 15 *L. G. B.*, p. xxxiv.

[4] 6 *L. G. B.*, p. xxxviii. The Board refer more especially to the Reports of Mr. Mozley, Mr. Davy, and Mr. Murray-Browne.

[5] 39 & 40 Vict. ch. 79.

Act was that each child had to be examined and reported upon individually. Mr. Bowyer thought that the change would act "as a stimulus to improvement, both in the teachers and in the pupils."[1] Mr. Mozley looked forward to the elder children bestowing more care on their annual examination. Mr. Holgate expected that Guardians and managers would become fully impressed with the necessity for every boy and girl obtaining the certificate before passing out of school to labour or to domestic service; that indifferent teachers would have to improve or resign their office; and that, for the first time, the actual results of their teaching would be clearly brought before their superiors. A spirit of healthy emulation would be set on foot in schools of more than one department, as either boys or girls showed a larger number of passes in any subject; while the whole status and well-being of the children and the schools would be improved by being thus brought more nearly to the level of other elementary schools.[2]

Complaints had for some time been made that provisionally certificated teachers who had been trained in training colleges were not qualified for their parchment certificates by their service in Poor Law schools. This was, of course, a great obstacle in the way of getting the best teachers for these schools. It was, however, to a large extent removed by the modified regulations of the Committee of Council of Education made in 1875,[3] and in 1889 they were enabled to obtain their certificates whilst in the service of the Guardians and managers when they had completed the term of service prescribed by Art. 62 of the Code of Regulations of the Education Department, and had received two and (when necessary) three favourable reports from the Poor Law Educational Inspectors.[4]

In 1877 the Board found it necessary to issue an Order[5] regulating the practice of boarding-out children *within* the Unions to which they are chargeable. It appears that some Unions were accustomed to grant outdoor relief by placing orphan and deserted children with foster-parents, who would otherwise come to the parish for relief. This was, of course, nothing else than relieving the foster parents at the expense of the children, and the danger is one attaching to

[1] Mr. Bowyer's remarks on this point are valuable. See 9 *L. G. B.*, p. 202.

[2] See 9 *L. G. B.*, p. 214; also 10 *L. G. B.*, p. 190.

[3] See 6 *L. G. B.*, p. 5. The regulations are set out *post*. See Appendix B., p. 402.

[4] 20 *L. G. B.*, p. 30. For a copy of the circular letter on this subject see *post*, Appendix B., p. 402; and see Mr. Mozley's remarks on the effect of this change, 19 *L. G. B.*, p. 157.

[5] 7 *L. G. B.*, p. 193. The Order of 1877 is now replaced by the later one of 1889.

boarding-out in both its forms. The regulations provided for the homes being suitable and proper for the children, and for their periodical supervision by the Medical and Relieving Officers, who were to report the results of their inspection to the Guardians.

In the following year (1878) the interest of the Central Authority in raising the standard of Poor Law Education to the proper mark, and keeping it on a level with that of Public Elementary Education generally, was again shown by the issue of a General Order[1] prescribing the keeping by the masters and mistresses of Attendance Registers. These registers were to be produced to the Visiting Committees on their visits to the schools, and to the Guardians or Boards of Management when they should desire to see them, and had to be preserved for ten years. The order also contained the important regulation that the standards of examination to be observed should be those prescribed in the Code of the Education Department in force for the time being.[2] Time-tables were also to be prepared. And as showing how the *industrial* training of children was still regarded as of the highest importance, the Board authorised in many cases the withdrawing from school of children over thirteen who had passed the fourth standard of the Code for the purpose of their getting more of such training. At the same time the arrangements for mental instruction were to be such as to ensure these children being kept up to the fourth standard while they remained in the school.[3]

It is satisfactory to find the inspectors reporting continued improvement in education since this time (1882), notwithstanding the disadvantages under which so many of the children were placed owing to the short periods during which they were under instruction; the number of children presented in the higher standards, and the proportion of passes in each subject taught, increasing year by year.[4] The progress is especially remarkable in the subject of arithmetic.

In 1894 the Elementary Education Act of 1893 came into operation. This Act raised to eleven years the minimum age for exemption (whether total or partial), fixed by the local bye-laws made under the Education Acts. Although this provision of the Act had no application to Poor Law schools, many Boards of Guardians and

[1] General Order of 3rd April, 1878.

[2] Up to this time the general words of Article 114 of the Order of 1847 controlled the education of Poor Law children.

[3] See 12 *L. G. B.*, p. xxxvi.

[4] See 12 *L. G. B.*, pp. 74, 108; 13 *L. G. B.*, p. 130; 14 *L. G. B.*, pp. 45, 56, 59; 15 *L. G. B.*, pp. 42, 45, 50; 16 *L. G. B.*, p. xlix.; 17 *L. G. B.*, pp. 89 and 95; 18 *L. G. B.*, pp. 144, 149, and 155; 19 *L. G. B.*, pp. lxxxvii., etc.; 20 *L. G. B.*, p. 258; 22 *L. G. B.*, pp. 103, 113; 23 *L. G. B.*, p. 151; 24 *L. G. B.*, pp. 70, 75.

Managers of Schools have, as Mr. Holgate advised, read "this legislation as affecting the children in their schools not merely so far as regards their discharge into the world to service or paid occupation, but as regards their exemption from any industrial labour (other than needlework for girls) and their attending schools as whole-timers until eleven years of age, quite independently of any standard" which they might have passed.[1]

Ten years having elapsed since the issuing of the order relating to children boarded out beyond the limits of their own Unions, the Central Authority caused their inspectors to report upon the 601 children so boarded out in their several districts. The reports so obtained are generally favourable to the practice, only a few cases having been discovered where the homes had not been selected with sufficient care, or the regulations infringed.[2] Mr. Murray Browne was charged with making a special report upon the children under the supervision of the King's Norton Boarding-out Committee. He described it as "one of the oldest and most important in the country," and while his Report is on the whole favourable to the system, he is obliged to make the important admission that the children did not, as a rule, impress him in any respect more favourably than the workhouse-bred children, whose history he had investigated some years previously.[3] In fact, the percentage of failures among boarded-out children was twice as great as among those who had received their education in workhouses.[4] Further reports were made by the inspectors in 1884, and they were generally favourable to the system.[5] But the great increase in the number of children boarded out *without* the Unions necessitated the appointment of a special inspector, and in 1885 the present inspector, Miss Mason, was appointed to the post. Her Reports, which have been published annually since 1886, must be read by anyone who wishes to have a real grasp of the subject. Although many cases of cruelty and neglect on the part of foster parents, and of undesirable homes are noted by her, her evidence with regard to the interest taken in the welfare of the children by members of Boarding-out Committees, and the warm feeling entertained for

[1] See 23 *L. G. B.*, p. 154.

[2] See 11 *L. G. B.*, pp. xxxix.-xlii. A list of the Boarding-out Committees authorised to act at this time will be found in 12 *L. G. B.*, pp. 281-283. They were 80 in number.

[3] 11 *L. G. B.*, p. 140.

[4] The report on the results of a workhouse education referred to by Mr. Murray Browne is printed in 6 *L. G. B.*, pp. 36-47. The failures were 5·26 per cent. in the case of the workhouse schools, and 11·3 per cent. in the boarded-out children.

[5] 14 *L. G. B.*, p. xxxiv.

occupations of the school. (Art. ii.) An exception, however, was made by Art. iii., which allows children suffering from any of the affections specified to be admitted into a school, if separate accommodation, with an entirely distinct administration and staff of officers, is provided for them.

It cannot be said, therefore, that the Central Authority has left any stone unturned to keep the schools free from disease; nor has it been unsuccessful in its efforts towards that object.

In 1894 a Departmental Committee, resulting from a deputation to the President of the Local Government Board, which urged an inquiry into Poor Law Schools, was appointed. The Minute of Appointment is dated the 18th September, 1894, and the Committee had "to inquire into the existing systems for the maintenance and education of children under the charge of managers of district schools and Boards of Guardians in the Metropolis, and to advise as to any changes which might be desirable."[1]

This Committee reported on the 28th February, 1896. Their Report condemned the system of aggregating children in large numbers in one large building, accorded a very small measure of praise to "Cottage Homes," and advocated more use being made of boarding-out and certified houses. The Sheffield system of "detached" homes was approved of. The establishment of a new Central Authority for the supervision of all the Poor Law children of the Metropolis was recommended.[2]

The allegations of the Report had the effect of arousing a storm of indignation in the public press, during which sober people were not able to get a hearing, although it soon began to be rumoured that many of the statements of the Report were not borne out by the evidence. When the evidence was published glaring discrepancies between it and the Report were disclosed.[3] Whether rightly or wrongly the Committee were accused of bias; and indeed the wholesale condemnation of large schools, the attack on the Central Authority,[4] and the very scanty acknowledgment of the work of the

[1] The Committee as originally appointed consisted of Mr. A. J. Mundella, M.P. (Chairman), Sir J. E. Gorst, M.P., Hon. E. Lyulph Stanley, Rev. Brooke Lambert, Dr. J. Russell Reynolds, Mr. W. Vallance, and Mrs. H. O. Barnett; but on 6th November, 1894, Mr. E. Nettleship was appointed in the place of Sir J. Russell Reynolds, resigned, and on the 29th January, 1895, Dr. Fitch (now Sir Joshua Fitch) was added to the Committee. Mr. A. F. Aveling (clerk to the Paddington Board of Guardians) was appointed secretary to the Committee.

[2] We have dealt with this important Report separately. See Appendix A, p. 358.

[3] The publication of the Report preceded that of the evidence by some weeks.

[4] The Report is in fact much more an attack upon the administration of the Local Government Board than on the Guardians and school managers.

Guardians and the school managers, seem to lend some colour to the charge. But when on the strength of the Report, which after all only affected Metropolitan schools, an Education Bill was produced by the Government which proposed to transfer the supervision, care, and control of the Poor Law children both of the Metropolis and of the provinces to new and untried bodies, (the introducer of the Bill being himself a prominent member of the Committee), Boards of Guardians, which are slow bodies to act, were put on their mettle. At a special Conference of Guardians from all parts of the country held in London in June, 1896, a resolution was carried recording its opinion that the evidence given to the Committee did not substantiate the case made out by the Report against the Local Government Board and the Guardians, or furnish grounds for the transfer of the children to the Education Department and to new County Educational Authorities. But at the same time the Conference expressed itself as entirely in favour of assimilating the teaching of the children in all respects to that of other children, and that they should also be afforded the benefits of technical instruction.

How the Bill was dropped by the Government is a matter of history. The controversy on the subject of the Report still goes on, and whatever may be said against it, no one will deny that fair consideration should be given to its recommendations.[1] It must not, however, be forgotten that most of the recommendations were actually suggested by what the Committee saw being carried out in some of the schools,[2] and had the Committee frankly acknowledged their indebtedness in this matter, they would not have exposed themselves to the charge of prejudice and bias against the system of large schools.

We shall now proceed to describe the various systems of educating and training Poor Law children in force at the present time, endeavouring to weigh the *pros* and *cons* of each system fairly and dispassionately. We shall begin with the oldest system, viz., that of the Workhouse School.

[1] One of the results of the Report has been the Order transferring the care and maintenance of particular classes of children to the Metropolitan Asylums Board. See Chapter xiii., p. 339.

[2] See the Memorandum of the Rev. Brooke Lambert and of Mr. W. Vallance. Report, p. 174.

CHAPTER I.

WORKHOUSE SCHOOLS

WORKHOUSE schools are of two kinds. They may either form part of the workhouse buildings, or they may be detached.[1] But a further subdivision must be made according as the "detached" workhouse school is under the general supervision of the workhouse master, or under a separate superintendent independent of him. Where the workhouse school is entirely separated from the workhouse by not being on the same piece of ground, and by being under a separate superintendent, it is to all intents and purposes a "separate" school, and does not come within the purview of this chapter. Such are the "detached" workhouse schools at Nottingham, Ormskirk, Flimby, Chesterfield, Merthyr Tydfil, etc. In this chapter we merely refer to those Poor Law schools, whether detached or not, which are situated on the same area as the rest of the workhouse buildings, and which are, in the distinct sense of the word, "workhouse schools," where the teaching as well as the maintenance of the children is provided for.

There are two main disadvantages which are peculiar to the workhouse schools of which we speak in this chapter, the first arising from the difficulty of securing and retaining good teachers, and the second from the monotonous life which the children lead. In the larger workhouse schools the difficulty of getting efficient teachers to stay is not so much felt, since the numbers of the children encourage them to put forth their best efforts; but in the smaller schools, with perhaps less than thirty children in them, the difficulty is a very real one. Later on we shall enlarge on these two disadvantages along with other disadvantages of the system which are not specially peculiar to it.[2] We hope, however, to show how the workhouse school system has produced and can still produce results

[1] According to the last Report of the Local Government Board, in ninety-eight Unions and parishes the children were being educated in workhouse schools.

[2] See *post*, pp. 50–60.

of no slight merit, and that its disadvantages, although real, do not often reach the point of being a calamity to the child.[1]

How far the average workhouse school may have improved during the last thirty years may be judged from the reports of the Inspectors. Thus in 1868 Mr. Bowyer reported of the schools in the Eastern and Midland districts that most of the teachers were possessed of no higher qualification for their office than a moderate acquaintance with Scripture and arithmetic, together with tolerable reading and writing;[2] and later, in 1871, Mr. T. B. Browne told us that he knew instances of the appointment of persons related to the Guardians who were utterly unfit for their work; or of persons appointed out of compassion because they had failed in their ordinary business, or lest they should become chargeable to the Poor Rate.

"In a recent case," he wrote, "I found a girl of thirteen acting as schoolmistress for no intelligible reason but because she happened to be the governor's daughter. It does not appear from what I have heard as to the appointment of teachers that the best candidate is always selected. The inferior teachers are usually appointed to the smaller schools."[3]

Then there was the difficulty in forming classes, and of giving proper industrial training. On the last point Mr. Bowyer[4] says:

"If, as is generally the case, the children are mostly very young, it is impossible to set apart a piece of land to be cultivated exclusively by the elder boys, who are consequently employed, if at all, on the same land as the men, and often under the charge of the superintendent of adult labour, or of an old inmate. The girls, on the other hand, are overburdened with needlework and household duties, which there are not sufficient able-bodied women in the house to perform, and their progress in school instruction is consequently retarded. Nor does the training they obtain from these labours fully compensate for the intellectual and moral sacrifice they have entailed, as they are of a nature to fit girls rather for employment in a wholesale clothing establishment than for domestic service, the calling to which most of them are destined. One or two girls may, it is true, be employed in the kitchen, together with some of the able-bodied women; but this

[1] See *post*, Chapter ii. Miss F. Davenport Hill's criticism on workhouse schools in her book, *The Children of the State*, second edition (1889), pp. 13–44, must be received with caution. Most of the evidence she adduces against the system is prior to 1870, and she appears to think that the evils of the workhouse school of the present day are as intense as they were in 1841! She also quotes largely from Mr. Tufnell's Report, who was as pronounced an opponent of "workhouse" schools as he was an ardent advocate of "district" schools. But when Mr. Tufnell is not on her side—*e.g.*, he strongly opposed the boarding-out of pauper children—I cannot find that she even mentions his name.

[2] 20 *P. L. R.*, p. 139. [3] 1 *L. G. B.*, p. 235.

[4] 20 *P. L. R.*, p. 139. See also *ibid.*, p. 156.

can seldom be done without violating the classification established by the Poor Laws among the inmates of workhouses, a regulation to which it is nowhere of greater importance strictly to adhere than with reference to the children who are there for the purpose of being unpauperised."

Mr. Bowyer then goes on to describe an ordinary workhouse school at that time (1868) as follows:[1]

"It generally opens on a yard enclosed by a high wall, with a circular swing in its centre for exercise during play hours. The room is usually about 20 feet long by 10 broad, with a flat ceiling 10 or 11 feet high, imperfectly ventilated by means of openings high up in the wall, or perforated zinc tubes traversing the room from wall to wall, and opening outside. The windows are small and square, and if they should look out upon an adult ward they are darkened by whitewashing the panes. During the dark days in winter the instruction of the children is much hindered by want of light, while their spirits and probably their health must be affected by the closeness occasioned by the lowness of the ceiling. I must, however, add that the windows are always opened whenever the weather is such as to allow it, so that the children do not suffer so much in health from these defects as would otherwise be the case. The floors are generally of brick or stone, but wooden flooring has supplanted the colder material in many instances. In the older schoolrooms the desk and the benches are placed against the walls; in the new ones or in the old ones that have been refurnished parallel desks have been introduced. The school apparatus is generally sufficient, though that part of it which consists in maps cannot unfortunately be renewed so often as would be necessary to keep pace with the changes effected by events in political geography. The books most in use are the reading series of the Irish Commissioners, but they are beginning to be superseded by more recent educational works. Some of these are an improvement on the former; others, compiled with a view to enabling the children in schools inspected by the Committee of Council to pass the examination required under the revised codes, are purposely made too easy and too uninstructive to be a desirable importation into schools not examined in the same manner."

In spite of all the defects of workhouse schools at that time, Mr. Bowyer considered that in religious knowledge and in reading, writing, and arithmetic they would bear comparison with any other elementary schools, and would probably surpass these latter in the proportion of the number of children who attained proficiency out of the total number on the books.[2] He also bore witness to the improvement in the moral training of the children during the twenty years that they had been under his inspection, and to the important fact that they turned out on an average as well as other children of the labouring

[1] 20 *P. L. B.*, p. 139. [2] *Ibid.*, p. 141.

classes; while those of them who had been educated in the best schools generally rose to a condition of comfort, and sometimes to one of comparative affluence.[1]

Mr. T. B. Browne, reporting in 1867 on the workhouse schools in the Western District, said that the number of really good ones was very considerable, and that the children generally became emancipated from pauperism when they left them.[2] He gives a very interesting comparison between the results of the training and education of the children in two Shropshire Unions. Whitchurch sent its children out to school; Atcham educated them in the workhouse school. Although the population of Whitchurch Union was considerably more than half that of Atcham, yet for one child whom the Whitchurch Guardians educated nominally, the Atcham Guardians gave a real education to ten.[3]

He recurs again to the same subject in 1873, and shows how it was possible for the standard of education in a workhouse to be higher than what was obtainable in a national school; for the reason that in the workhouse school an intelligent and conscientious teacher, who had the children at all times under him, would be in a position to form their characters and principles in a way which most parents of the labouring classes would be quite incompetent to do. He goes on as follows:

"National and British Schools are often very large, and the utmost the teachers can do is to instruct and qualify the children to pass before the inspector; but the absence of all control over the children out of school hours would alone prevent education in the higher sense of the term. It is plain that this last can seldom be done at home. The parents are too busy, too tired after their day's work, and usually ill-qualified. I apprehend that there are few labourers' wives who would not punish a child more severely for accidentally breaking a cup than for telling a falsehood. The child is apt to be hastily punished, rather because the parent is in a passion, than because the child has done wrong. In drunken homes matters must be still worse. On the other hand, teachers in workhouses, if qualified for their office, must not only have a wider range of ideas than is at all common with labourers and their wives, but they are likely to be less impulsive, more just, more judicious, and according to the regulations of the Local Government Board they cannot punish until after a certain interval. The behaviour of little children, the confident way in which I have seen them go up to the schoolmistress more especially and

[1] 20 *P. L. B.*, p. 142. See also 23 *P. L. B.*, pp. 232–3.
[2] 20 *P. L. B.*, p. 146; 23 *P. L. B.*, p. 237. See too the very interesting letters from a workhouse master to Mr. Browne on this subject, showing how little a workhouse education had to do with hereditary pauperism.
[3] 20 *P. L. B.*, p. 147.

so far as the mere inculcation of knowledge was concerned, while in respect of the technical subjects of instruction the schools were in a satisfactory state.[1]

How devoted has been the interest taken by many schoolmasters and schoolmistresses in the workhouse children is well known, and we do not think the following case, which Mr. Wyndham Holgate mentions as one of "exceptional thoughtfulness, ingenuity, and perseverance," is so exceptional as he supposes.

"At the Dover Union Schools," he writes in 1889, "the mistress has endeavoured to advance the intelligence of her girls, and to give them some practical knowledge of everyday life, by laying the foundation of a very useful museum, which she has obtained chiefly from leading manufacturing firms, who have gratuitously supplied her with specimens of their wares from the commencement to the finished article. Amongst others I noticed complete collections from Messrs. Strutt, cotton spinners; Messrs. Bryant and May, match manufacturers; and Messrs. Fry, the well-known cocoa and chocolate house.

"She has also painted on the floor of the schoolroom and on the door-posts various diagrams showing the cardinal points of the compass; the motions of the earth; the zones; latitude and longitude; squares, cubes, angles and triangles; yards, feet, and inches. She has further decorated her walls with flowers of her own painting, and with some of the pictures used as advertisements by the well-known firms of Pears, Nestlé, etc.

"She has not forgotten to take advantage of the country walks with her children, by making them collect and telling them the names of the various wild flowers of the district; whilst her window-sills are filled with growing plants and ferns of many kinds. I need hardly say that this humanising process, though only of a few months' growth, is rapidly raising the tone and intelligence of her children in a very marked degree."[2]

The difficulties which attend the education of children in workhouse schools are illustrated in the following extract from Mr. Mozley's 1874 Report. He is speaking of the state of education in the girls' schools as being not entirely satisfactory.

"This unsatisfactoriness is, indeed, not in every case due to the fault of the individual schoolmistress, or at least not to that principally. Defective apparatus, untidy books, a dark, dreary room, are powerful antagonists to the energies of any teacher; and instances of all these are to be found among the schools to which I refer. Sometimes a school sinks into a state too low to be restored to efficiency by any but a first-rate teacher; and schoolmistress after schoolmistress tries her hand at it and resigns in despair. In some schools the fluctuations

[1] 4 *L. G. B.*, p. 198. [2] 19 *L. G. B.*, p. 155.

among the children are so rapid that little permanent impression can be produced on them, and this again discourages a teacher. Several of these schools are too large to be managed by a single teacher; several are too small to attract a competent teacher. Nevertheless, when all these sources of failure (in themselves for the most part sufficiently to be regretted) are taken into consideration, it remains true that a by no means inconsiderable proportion of workhouse schoolmistresses are very defective in the qualities which constitute a teacher."[1]

Mr. Mozley was at this time (1874) unable to suggest a remedy, for although it would be an easy matter to refuse certificates to these inferior teachers, it is doubtful whether any better could be got in their place. And then, as Mr. T. B. Browne remarked in 1872, the possession of a certificate of merit might be a test of a person's attainments, but it was by no means a test of his teaching power.[2]

It is to the causes we have mentioned that must be attributed the constant changes of teachers. Dr. Clutterbuck, writing so late as 1884, referred to the growing tendency to make service in a Poor Law school a mere stepping-stone to employment elsewhere. He said that a restless desire for change was the marked characteristic of the majority of the teachers. "The causes of their restlessness are not far to seek. Their work is much more laborious, trying, and responsible than that of teachers in public elementary schools; while the restrictions of workhouse life, necessary perhaps under existing circumstances to the discipline and organization of these institutions, become at last insupportable to energetic and capable teachers. It is, indeed, but natural to rather dwell upon the drawbacks than to appreciate the advantages incident to any position in life. Hence it is in vain to endeavour to point out to them the real greatness of their work. Insensibly, but not without many self-sacrifices cheerfully made, they begin to relax efforts which appear to meet with so little sympathy, and which are persistently depreciated by an ignorant outside public; and hence even noble natures retire in disgust at last from thankless toil."[3] It is unnecessary to give any more abstracts from the Inspectors' Reports to emphasize a fact which it is impossible to gainsay.[4] This rapidity of change also leads to an interval occurring between the resignation of one teacher and the

[1] 4 *L. G. B.*, p. 198.
[2] 2 *L. G. B.*, p. 109. As to the qualifications for teachers in Poor Law schools see *post*, p. 95.
[3] 14 *L. G. B.*, p. 52.
[4] If further evidence is wanted, see *e.g.* 2 *L. G. B.*, pp. 90, 107; and 11 *L. G. B.*, p. 180.

appointment of another, which is, of course, very prejudicial to the education of the children.[1]

It may, of course, be urged that the above criticisms are founded on what is "ancient history," and that the decision[2] of the Education Department in 1889 to grant parchment certificates to teachers in Poor Law schools who had qualified themselves for them has lessened the difficulty of getting good teachers for the workhouse schools. No doubt this decision has had the effect of raising the status of the teachers, and may have induced them in some cases to remain permanently in their situations;[3] but we are afraid that the tardy recognition of their services by the Education Department is not a sufficient set off to the defects which we have pointed out. The monotony of a teacher's life in a workhouse school may be relieved in many ways, but where (as is the case in most workhouse schools) the number of children is small, this fact alone will make it very difficult to get competent teachers for them.[4]

Writing as lately as 1894 Mr. Byam Davies says, that "in the case of small schools it is generally only with the greatest difficulty that a vacancy, when it occurs, can be filled, as there are scarcely any applicants. It is rare, however, now," he adds, "for any schoolmaster or schoolmistress to be appointed who has not had some experience in teaching."[5]

Country Guardians have in most cases solved the difficulty by giving up their schools in the workhouse, and sending the children to the public elementary schools.[6]

(2) *The Monotonous Life of the Children.*

This is a defect from which no institution where children are *continuously* kept is free, but undoubtedly the evil is enhanced in a workhouse school. It can, of course, be relieved by a little care and attention on the part of the Guardians. Mr. Mozley, who has often in his reports expressed his opinion that the degree of confinement of children within the walls of workhouses may be overstrained and so act prejudicially both on their faculties of observation and on their acquisition of practical knowledge, suggests the line which Guardians should take in this important matter. He alludes to the provision of materials of amusement for boys and girls, footballs, bats, stumps,

[1] See 4 *L. G. B.*, p. 200. Mr. Mozley suggests that during such an interval the children might be sent to schools outside the workhouse. *Ibid.*
[2] *Ante*, p. 39.
[3] See 19 *L. G. B.*, p. 157.
[4] See 21 *L. G. B.*, p. 188.
[5] 24 *L. G. B.*, p. 75.
[6] Mr. Mozley foresaw this end to the difficulty in 1886. See 16 *L. G. B.*, p. 111.

and a ball for cricket, skipping-ropes, battledores and shuttlecocks, circular swings, etc.; and for the infants, boxes of wooden bricks, etc.; to the provision of a suitable library for the children who can read, and a certain number of illustrated books for children of all ages;[1] the provision of means for teaching singing, books of songs, etc.; the hanging up of pictures, either of animals or remarkable scenes, on the walls of the schoolroom and dayroom; to the children walking out at least once a week to some place comparatively distant from the workhouse, so that they may know something of the country round.[2]

It is perhaps not generally known, so that it may be as well to state it, that the Local Government Board will authorise anything which may have a tendency to promote the healthy development of the workhouse children.[3]

Mr. Mozley, who in his eagerness to promote mental development does not forget the importance of physical development, quotes the case of the Flimby Schools of the Cockermouth Union, where both boys and girls have good pieces of garden, and where the boys, under the direction of the schoolmaster, have wheeled up great stones from the beach and made rockeries of them. And on a recent visit to the same Union he found the same energetic schoolmaster, immediately after the afternoon school, sitting down to teach two of the boys the violin, and a third the horn. He adds: "The performance did not grate on my ear, and this, considering the difficulty of playing the violin, is considerable praise."[4]

In his 1873 Report also he describes the boys in the Whitehaven Workhouse as cultivating small patches of flower gardens, which is, of course, always a practicable form of amusement.[5]

In his 1889 Report the same Inspector gives other instances of the pains which Guardians take in many Unions to provide for the amusements of the children;[6] and, indeed, the lamentable sight of children "sitting perfectly idle and listless within four square walls of a court," which he refers to in an earlier Report,[7] is not often presented to an observer nowadays.

Probably no workhouse school labours under more disadvantages than that of the Medway Union. The school is situated in the centre of the workhouse, which is itself in the centre of a large town. Under such conditions it would seem impossible for the children to thrive,

[1] Mr. Mozley gives a list of desirable books in his Report. See 5 *L. G. B.*, p. 146.
[2] 5 *L. G. B.*, p. 145; see also 2 *L. G. B.*, p. 92; 16 *L. G. B.*, p. 99.
[3] 14 *L. G. B.*, pp. 47, 48.
[4] 19 *L. G. B.*, p. 147. See also 14 *L. G. B.*, p. 47.
[5] 17 *L. G. B.*, p. 98.
[6] 2 *L. G. B.*, p. 92.
[7] 14 *L. G. B.*, p. 47.

and yet under the charge of an excellent master and mistress both boys and girls do remarkably well, and "failures" are very few. In 1889 Mr. J. S. Davy gives an account of the amusements which the boys have.

"The boys of the Medway Workhouse Schools have, I am pleased to report, won for the second year in succession the challenge cup for Association football open to clubs of boys under fourteen in the Chatham district. There are over twenty entries for this cup, the competition for which excites great interest in the neighbourhood, and I am informed that the workhouse boys usually win their ties by their superior staying power. Their cricket club is very successful in their matches. These schools are an integral part of a large urban workhouse, and no enthusiast for boarding-out, or cottage homes, or separate schools will believe that boys brought up in them can be healthy or energetic enough to be capable of playing an honest game of football, much less of beating boys like the sons of the Royal Engineers. However, the fact remains, and is alike creditable to the officers of the workhouse, and to the Guardians who interest themselves in the matter."[1]

Mr. Wyndham Holgate takes up the tale[2] of this extraordinarily successful school. He tells us that "the boys played and won three matches at cricket against the three best school teams of the district, while at chess they won three of the six matches played. Two of the boys were among thirty of the best players of the district chosen to meet Mr. Blackburn in an exhibition game. One of them was among the last four who fell. Mr. Blackburn was highly pleased with their play, and as a reward each boy was given 5*s*. This school also gave three public concerts during the year, at which they were well received, and the audience greatly pleased."

It is this monotonous, confined, isolated life which is alleged to have an especially bad effect upon girls, rendering them stupid and timid, and we would not deny that this is true in many instances; but that in *well-managed* workhouse schools this is not so is shown by the happy and cheerful letters which many of the girls write to their friends and teachers at the workhouse after they have left it.[3]

(3) *The evil of close contact with adult paupers.*

It was the acknowledgment of this evil which led Poor Law reformers to advocate the establishment of district schools.[4]

"The efforts to impart industrial instruction to the children in a workhouse school has a constant tendency to throw them into at least

[1] 19 *L. G. B.*, p. 110. [2] *Ibid.*, p. 156.
[3] Mr. Mozley has published one of these letters, which he describes "as one of the most attractive that I ever saw of the kind." See 10 *L. G. B.*, p. 175.
[4] See *post*, p. 83.

occasional intercourse with the adult members. Eagerness to avail himself of fine weather for the setting or getting up of potatoes, or for other agricultural operations, is a strong temptation to the master of a workhouse to set boys and men at work together, while the desire to utilise the labour of a journeyman tailor or shoemaker, who may have been driven to the workhouse by vicious and intemperate habits, occasionally leads to his being employed in the same workshop with the boys."[1]

And the above remarks, of course, apply with still greater force to the industrial training of girls.

(4) *The Difficulty of Securing Proper Classification.*

Classification is almost impossible where the number of children is small. As Mr. Bowyer remarked in 1867, "one or two dozen children of all ages and standing as pupils cannot be formed into classes according to their proficiency without exhibiting the absurd result of a first class consisting of only two or three children; or, as is often the case, of the entire absence of a first class, owing to these two or three children having left the school, and there being none sufficiently instructed to take their place."[2]

(5) *The Difficulty of Securing Proper Industrial Training.*

This is also a difficulty which results from small numbers. The number of boys is generally not large enough to justify the appointment of any special industrial trainer; nor are there often enough elder boys to cultivate a piece of land by themselves without mixing them with adult paupers, as we have already mentioned.[3]

As to the girls, their work does not suffer to the same extent as the boys, as there is always the housework and needlework to do, although there is the danger of their being overworked if the number of hands does not suffice. Mr. Mozley, in his 1879 Report, said that "in small workhouse schools the boys have sometimes hardly any industrial work; it is, indeed, seldom, I believe, that they do not do some little sweeping and scrubbing; but even in household work they fall much short of what the girls do. Gardening is not often carried on outside the summer months; and some workhouses have either no land at all, or too little to give the boys any employment."[4] We go more fully into this question in the next chapter.[5]

[1] Per Mr. Wodehouse, 20 *P. L. B.*, p. 156.
[2] 20 *P. L. B.*, p. 139. See also 1 *L. G. B.*, p. 228.
[3] *Ante*, p. 58. [4] 9 *L. G. B.*, p. 209.
[5] *Post*, pp. 71–76.

Mr. T. B. Browne stated in 1873 that from inquiries made not more than five per cent., if so many, of those children who left the workhouse, and were capable of earning a living, returned to it in after years.[1]

Mr. Bowyer, who started as an Inspector of Poor Law Schools with the preconceived opinion that the plan of training children, whose tendencies might reasonably be supposed to be the reverse of industrious, to a life of industry and morality in the very refuge of pauperism and vice was paradoxical and absurd, was led by the facts he observed and by most careful inquiries to a directly contrary opinion. He found that by far the greater part of the children who returned to the workhouse did so from no fault of their own; but that even these children remained but a very short time in the house, unless the cause of their return was ill-health or mental infirmity. As to those who were returned in consequence of misconduct, the great majority were only guilty of slight faults incident to youth and inexperience, and a large proportion of them subsequently turned out well. He gave cases to show how little influence the association of the workhouse exercised in causing the children to turn out ill.[2]

Two years before, the same inspector had obtained statistics from the masters of various schools with regard to the fate of the children who had left them during a certain number of years. We can only give one of the returns here, and must refer our readers to Mr. Bowyer's very valuable Report for the others.

From the Wisbeach Union, sixty-five boys and sixty-seven girls went out to service between 1858 and 1871. Of these only one boy and seven girls were returned to the workhouse for misconduct. It is further reported of the boys that "a large majority are known to be well situated; many of them have proved themselves excellent workmen and exemplary characters"; and of the girls "many of them are doing exceedingly well, having held the same situation for many years, while others have entered the service of very high families."[3]

In his Report for 1874, Mr. Murray Browne went most fully into

[1] 3 *L. G. B.*, p. 283.

[2] 2 *L. G. B.*, pp. 96, 104. It is perhaps well to say that all the similar inquiries which have been made since 1872 by the Poor Law Inspectors have shown similar results. See *e.g.* 4 *L. G. B.*, pp. 183-190, 193; 5 *L. G. B.*, pp. 150, 152; 6 *L. G. B.*, pp. 75-77; 9 *L. G. B.*, p. 212; 10 *L. G. B.*, pp. 180-190; 11 *L. G. B.*, p. 135; 15 *L. G. B.*, p. 41; 19 *L. G. B.*, p. 148; and 22 *L. G. B.*, pp. 105-106.

[3] See 23 *P. L. B.*, pp. 227-228. Mr. Bowyer gives statistics from other workhouse schools, which all show equally satisfactory results. *Ibid.*, pp. 229-230. From the Dunmow Workhouse Schools thirty-five girls were sent out to domestic service between 1861 and 1871 and all were doing well. *Ibid.*, p. 230. See also 2 *L. G. B.*, p. 97.

the subject. He admits, of course, that the existing workhouse schools were defective in many points, and that he could easily suggest material improvements; but he shows most distinctly that the great majority of the children educated in them turned out well in after life.[1]

Mr. Bowyer in 1875 stated that out of 1109 boys and 1170 girls placed out by the Guardians of thirty-eight schools in his district, 90·9 per cent. of the boys and 84 per cent. of the girls were known to be prospering.[2]

Mr. Mozley in his 1877 Report publishes a list of the boys who had been sent out from the Teesdale Workhouse since 1848. The list therefore covers a period of twenty-eight years, and it appears that out of the fifty-three boys educated in the Teesdale Workhouse only one could be said to have turned out badly. One was dead, eight had been lost sight of, forty-three were doing well. Among these forty-three was an owner of tea plantations, a master file-cutter, two master tailors, a master coach-builder, a master painter, a commercial traveller, one who was going to be ordained, and several others holding positions of not less responsibility than the above.[3]

Mr. Murray Browne, in a Report on the results of Workhouse School Education in 1877, which is a continuation of his 1875 Report referred to above, confirms by further examples the result of his previous inquiry.[4]

In 1880 Mr. Mozley refers to two workhouse lists of children sent out to service during a long term of years. From the Thirsk Workhouse eight boys and ten girls had been sent to employment since

[1] 4 *L. G. B.*, pp. 183-190. The general result was found to be 1·5 per cent. of failures in the case of the boys, and 10·4 per cent. in the case of the girls. *Ibid.*, p. 187. [2] 4 *L. G. B.*, p. 193. [3] 6 *L. G. B.*, p. 77.

[4] 6 *L. G. B.*, pp. 36-38 See also *post*, p. 213. Mr. Murray Browne justly says that no system of education had, so far as he was aware, been subjected to so severe a test as he had applied to workhouse schools, and he continues:

"Were such applied the results produced might possibly be of an unexpected nature; for example, out of thirty-six sons of gentlemen whose after lives are known to me, six (or about 17 per cent.) would, I think, be considered failures if they were workhouse-bred lads. This, be it observed, is the result of the best education the world can supply. It is to be hoped that the specimens upon which I have chanced have been singularly unfavourable. Again, out of 100 children educated in the National School of an agricultural parish in Gloucestershire, eighteen (as stated to me by the clergyman of the parish) have turned out badly. This again, it may be hoped, is an exceptional case, but the citation will at least serve as a caution to the inexperienced not hastily to assume that the pauper 5 per cent. of failures is an abnormally high proportion." (6 *L. G. B.*, p. 39.)

He refers again to this point in 1882, and says that two friends in different parts of the country have since been kind enough to make a similar calculation at his request. The net result of the three calculations is that out of 122 sons of gentlemen, twenty-one (or 17·2 per cent.) have so misconducted themselves as to be reckoned as social failures. (11 *L. G. B.*, p. 145.)

1868, and all were doing well ex[illegible] gi[illegible] en doing well for a time, but had "[illegible] ht [illegible] "[illegible] ' said the master, "are doing remarkably well, [illegible] to [illegible] and visit us too, whenever they can make it convenient."

From the Tynemouth Workhouse twenty-nine boys and seventy girls had gone out to employment since 1870. Twenty of the boys were known to be doing well, and of the girls fourteen were either doubtful, or had turned out badly, or had been lost sight of, while forty-two were doing well, the remaining five being dead. In this instance Mr. Mozley is not contented with the result as regards girls, although he rightly says "it is far removed from entire failure."[1]

Dr. Clutterbuck in 1881 gave a most instructive account of the results of his inquiry into the character and general capacity of the children who had been sent out to service during 1880 from *every* Poor Law School in his district. In answer to questions which he had put to employers of labour in the case of 710 children (348 boys and 362 girls) he had received replies in regard to 506 of them (243 boys and 263 girls). Of these 506, 360 had been characterised as *truthful*, 397 as *cheerful*, 365 as *intelligent*, 345 as *clean*, 450 as *honest*, 344 as *industrious*, and 450 as *healthy and strong*.[2] On examining the tables it will be found that only in *honesty* and *health* are the girls returned as equal to the boys, but these are perhaps the most important points of all.

Mr. Wyndham Holgate in his 1882 Report[3] published a return which had been obtained for him by a schoolmaster lately holding office in his district, which in his opinion proved that even in rural workhouse schools the results obtained by the teaching and training were decidedly satisfactory, where the officers of those schools were capable of instilling into the minds of their charges sound religious principles and habits of industry, and were supported by the rest of the workhouse staff in protecting the children from the dangers which surrounded them. This master gave a list of eighteen boys and nine girls who had been taught and trained by him during his tenure of office, and of whom only two boys had disgraced themselves.

Mr. Mozley tells us that he had a singularly good account given him in 1885 of the children who had been sent out from the Gainsborough Workhouse since the beginning of 1880. There was not a single bad report.[4] The same inspector relates that from the Malton Union

[1] 9 *L. G. B.*, p. 212. A further and very similar report on the results of the training and education in this workhouse school will be found in 13 *L. G. B.*, pp. 125-126.
[2] 10 *L. G. B.*, pp. 180-190.
[3] 11 *L. G. B.*, p. 135.
[4] 15 *L. G. B.*, p. 41.

Workhouse twenty-two boys and twelve girls had been sent out to service between 1877 and 1890, and that the master and matron were able to tell him the present situation of all of them except two brothers who had come somewhat late into the workhouse and were rather ne'er-do-weels. All the rest were doing well except one girl, who was only doing fairly. So also from the Durham Workhouse between 1885 and 1890, four boys and thirteen girls had been placed in service by the Guardians. All these children are doing well, except one girl who was doing moderately, and another girl who was in the workhouse suffering from a permanently disabled arm.[1]

At a recent meeting of the Isle of Thanet Board of Guardians it was stated that an investigation had been made as to the children who had left the workhouse schools between 1881 and 1897. It was found that 178 children (69 boys and 109 girls) had left the schools during that period, and been placed in varying positions, and that out of that number only two boys and five girls had turned out unsatisfactorily, or could honestly be deemed failures. It is also a significant fact that in the case of the girls five had been sent to Lady Rose Weigall's, and that two of the failures had occurred from that Institution.[2]

The children were accounted for as follows:

BOYS.		GIRLS.	
Emigrated	39	Emigrated	24
To Sea Service	8	To Service	50
To House Boy Brigade	19	Homes	23
Office	3	Schools	9
		Adopted	3
Total	69	Total	109
Failures	2	Failures—Bad, 2; Doubtful, 3	5

We have considered it important to refer at length to the subject because of the wrong impression under which the public labours, that workhouse children do not succeed in the world. In order to clinch the matter we will now refer to statistics which show how few of the adult inmates of workhouses at the present time have received a workhouse education. Had all the charges made against these schools been true we should naturally expect our workhouses to be at the present time full of adult paupers who twenty-five years ago were receiving a Poor Law education in workhouse schools, for it must not be forgotten that at the time three-fourths of the Unions had such schools.

[1] 19 *L. G. B.*, p. 148. Similarly good returns were obtained by Mr. Mozley from the Workhouse Schools of Derby and Boston.
[2] *Poor Law Officers' Journal*, 11th June, 1897.

Two returns which were obtained by Mr. Lockwood and Mr. Davy in 1892 and 1894 should have exploded the fallacy.

Mr. Lockwood's return is as follows:[1]

Return of adult inmates of fifty-four workhouses on the 15th March, 1892, who during childhood were educated in and from a workhouse, classified under headings, giving causes for needing relief. The last heading refers to adult female inmates not brought up in any workhouse.

MALES.		FEMALES.	
Weak-minded	23	Weak-minded	35
Cripple	17	Cripple	11
Defective eyesight	3	Defective eyesight	2
Able-bodied but not in regular employment	24	Able-bodied but not in regular employment	17
		Pregnancy (illegitimate)	36
		Total	101
		Unmarried mothers, not brought up in workhouses	221
Total	67		

"It will be seen from this return," says Mr. Lockwood, "that on a given day there were, in fifty-four workhouses with a total of 5550 adult inmates, sixty-seven men who in childhood received a workhouse education, but of these twenty-four only can be set down as responsible failures, the destitution of the remaining forty-three being caused by mental or physical infirmities which would in any case prevent their being self-supporting.

"Of the total 101 women, seventeen are returned as able-bodied, forty-eight as mentally or physically afflicted, while the cause of destitution in thirty-six cases is illegitimate maternity. It is deplorable, no doubt, that a cause implying immorality should be responsible for so high a percentage of the whole. I say implying, because as often as not, in her first misfortune at any rate, the girl is as much victim as delinquent; but, however that may be, the figures in the last column should give pause to the censors of a workhouse education, seeing that, whether victims or delinquents, the unfortunates who began life untainted by the workhouse outnumber the early tainted ones in the proportion of seven to one."

The following is Mr. Davy's return:

Return of adult inmates in fifty workhouses who during childhood were educated in or from a workhouse, classified under headings giving the causes for needing relief. The last heading refers to adult women not brought up in any workhouse.

MALES.		FEMALES.	
Weak-minded	57	Weak-minded	54
Cripple	22	Cripple	7
Defective eyesight	15	Defective eyesight	6
Able-bodied, not in regular employment	31	Pregnancy	5
		Able-bodied, not in regular employment	24
		Total	96
		Unmarried mothers, not brought up in workhouses	187
Total	125		

[1] 22 *L. G. B.*, p. 76.

Mr. Davy comments thus upon this return:

"Among a workhouse population of over 11,000 there were 221 who had been brought up in workhouse schools, and of these all but sixty were relieved because they were weak-minded, crippled, or otherwise disabled. Of these sixty several were old people who must have been in workhouses before 1848, when the education of pauper children was first organized after a fashion. At the same time in the same workhouses there were 187 unmarried mothers who were not brought up in a workhouse school. It is frequently alleged with much assurance, and in spite of clouds of witnesses to the contrary, that children who are educated at a workhouse school generally return to the workhouse and make it their home; and past experience makes it probable that the allegations will continue to be made and to be believed. Misrepresentations of this kind must be endured, however mischievous they may be; but it is curious that it has never struck the people who make them that if these statements are true the workhouses would be full of able-bodied inmates. As a matter of fact, the number of able-bodied paupers is extremely small either in or out of the workhouses, and are for the most part either widows with children or deserted wives."[1]

Mr. Baldwyn Fleming has also quite recently got out a similar return.[2] He shows that out of 7844 workhouse inmates only 160 had at some time or another been brought up in Poor Law Schools or workhouses, while of these 160 no less than 124 were unable, from physical or mental incapacity, to earn their own livelihood, thus leaving thirty-six (less than five per mille of the total number of workhouse inmates) who might be regarded as failures. He goes on to give full statistics of these thirty-six "failures," which show that six of these cases can scarcely be regarded as necessarily casting a reproach upon their training. He continues:

"Out of 7844 workhouse inmates there are, according to the above returns, about thirty who may fairly be counted as failures. These figures may not be wholly complete, but even assuming that they should be doubted, they cannot but give comfort to those who have spent time and effort in furthering the cause of pauper children, and they show how unfair and untrue is the popular cry that children

[1] 24 *L. G. B.*, p. 25. Mr. Lockwood has since had prepared very similar returns with regard to Metropolitan Workhouses. See *post*, p. 128. Mr. Davy, in a later report (25 *L. G. B.*, p. 173), says: "It is generally conceded that in some respects the least satisfactory of the existing methods of bringing up pauper children is the workhouse school. Such schools are now comparatively rare, whereas formerly they existed in all but the smallest Unions. They had been much improved before this plan of bringing up children in them was, for various reasons, generally abandoned. Yet defective as many of them were, it is absolutely certain that they were so far successful that with few exceptions the children brought up in them have been able to earn their own living."

[2] 25 *L. G. B.*, pp. 193–195.

brought up by the Guardians habitually become paupers in after life."[1]

These returns only bear out similar statistics of twenty years before. Mr. Doyle, while criticising very severely the Swansea Workhouse of 1875 as a most unsuitable place for the education and training of children, expressed his preference for it to "boarding-out," as carried out in the Union, and showed how even *this* workhouse was not "a nursery of vice," to which a very large proportion of the children brought up in it found their way back as the mothers of illegitimate children; for out of 547 able-bodied women admitted to the workhouse between September, 1871, and February, 1875, only seven were so brought up, and these had not received their entire education there.[2]

It must not be forgotten that even Mrs. Nassau Senior, in her celebrated Report, never alleged that children educated in workhouses return there in any considerable proportion. She contended that they turned out ill in other ways, but she admitted by implication that they had at least been depauperised. Mr. Murray Browne also reminds us that her unfavourable remarks, whether ill or well founded, applied only to girls, and only to Metropolitan schools. He says: "It is in truth the undoubted success of modern schools in this respect which has occasioned the cold reception which Guardians in general have given to the boarding-out movement. They know that the children sent forth from their schools do not return upon their hands; and they wisely hesitate to abandon a system which, upon the only point certainly known to them, produces certainly good results."[3]

The same inspector refers to "a certain class of gainsayers who will be satisfied with nothing short of an exact history of every individual child who has ever left a pauper school, vouched for by someone who has no connection whatever with the administration of the Poor Law. Such absolute sceptics must," he fears, "remain unconvinced"; but he is persuaded that "any reasonable person, who will take the trouble of reading the evidence," will be satisfied that the provincial pauper schools were doing excellent service to the country. He explains the cause of the persistent attacks which had been made from time to time upon these schools as in part arising from an undue impatience of the defects which exist in every system; but he believed the real explanation to be that the workhouse schools of former days were very bad; that the gradual but marked improvement in them which had taken

[1] Mr. Baldwyn Fleming merely wishes justice done to the workhouse schools; for he has always expressed his opinion very strongly that the workhouse is not the place for choice where children should be educated. (*Ibid.*, p. 195.)

[2] 4 *L. G. B.*, p. 179. [3] 6 *L. G. B.*, p. 41.

place, and which had been gradual and silent, and effected without flourish of trumpets or alteration in the outward fabric of the institution, had escaped the attention of the public; and that the reader of *Oliver Twist* still conceived all workhouse schools to conform to the model there described. Mr. Tufnell's denunciations of the modern workhouse schools of twenty years before were quoted as if they were applicable to the country workhouse schools of 1877. Mr. Tufnell, however, himself admitted the change that had taken place, and his latest opinion was that it was unnecessary to interfere with them.[1]

Dr. Clutterbuck in 1886 wrote to the same effect.[2] Far from endorsing the opinion that a child born and bred entirely in a workhouse was necessarily so inoculated with what so many people regarded as the evil *genius loci*, that it could not become a useful self-supporting member of the community, but must sooner or later after its discharge relapse into the ranks from which it sprang, he went so far as to assert that "for many little desolate pauper" children no home in the world could be found better than some rural workhouses in his own district, where master, matron, and teacher (the latter often the master's daughter) were alike united in their efforts to launch the frail little bark well equipped in every respect for its life voyage. He could state from his own personal knowledge that many grown-up men and women, now filling very respectable positions in life, and not a few of them occupying offices of trust and dignity, look back with gratitude to the lessons of thrift and self-reliance learned in the despised workhouse school which had made them what they were. He protested against the shameless misrepresentation and calumny, born of sheer prejudice or gross ignorance, or both, which sought to depreciate every form of goodness which did not recognize its own shibboleth. He extracted the following from a letter which he had received from the clerk to the Guardians of a very small Welsh Union. "No children who have been inmates of our workhouse *have ever come back upon the rates;* the matron takes great care of them, and is as kind to them as any mother."[3] He also gave figures showing the numbers of children who had been returned to the workhouses in his district during the ten years ending 1877, and who had been for at least *three* years on the books of the school prior to their first discharge.[4] It appears that out

[1] 6 *L. G. B.*, pp. 41-42. [2] 16 *L. G. B.*, p 103. [3] *Ibid.*, p. 105.

[4] Dr. Clutterbuck rightly says that less than three years' training would afford little proof of the value or the reverse of the influences brought to bear upon the child. He also excludes from the list all Unions which, whether recently or for a long period, had sent the children out to school, since the officials employed in the workhouse could not be held responsible for the success or failure in the training of children subjected to any other influence than their own.

of 2887 boys and 2436 girls, 93 boys and 177 girls had been returned for misconduct, or only 7·26 per cent. in the case of the girls, and 3·22 per cent. in the case of the boys. Dr. Clutterbuck could not believe that any other system of education for *this class of children* could show a fairer record, when it was remembered at how early an age the children were thrown upon the world. He added that, in the case of the girls, the alleged "misconduct" was in many instances of so trivial a nature that they might be considered as only temporary failures, new places having been found for them almost immediately after their return—which places they had managed to retain—thus considerably reducing the numbers of real failures.[1]

The assertion is of course made that, although the children may not return to the workhouses, they go wrong in other ways, but Mr. Murray Browne, writing in 1877, says:

"It is surely incumbent upon the assertor to prove his case, and setting aside the Metropolitan schools, of which I have no personal knowledge, there is absolutely no evidence which even pretends to establish so sweeping an assertion. It is possible indeed that there still remain, here and there, bad workhouse schools. Maladministration will spoil any system, and when such instances occur, no efforts should be spared to remove them. But we are at present concerned with the system in general, and not with possible exceptions. And there is strong positive evidence to show that the system in general works well."[2]

In 1891 the master of the Tonbridge Workhouse sent Mr. Davy a return, which showed that out of forty-nine boys and girls who had been sent out to service from the schools of the Union during the previous fourteen years, twenty-two were in the same situations to which they were originally sent, four had been returned to the workhouse for various reasons, and only one, a girl who was taken away from her situation by her mother, had been lost sight of.[3]

In 1892 Mr. Wyndham Holgate, while expressing his satisfaction that the workhouse school of the Mile End Board of Guardians has been broken up, acknowledged that the result of the education and training under the old system had been surprisingly creditable, considering the drawbacks and difficulties with which a deserving staff of officers had had to contend.[4]

[1] 16 *L. G. B.*, p. 108.

[2] 6 *L. G. B.*, p. 41. Mr. Murray Browne alludes especially to the results of his own inquiries (4 *L. G. B.*, p. 183, and 6 *L. G. B.*, p. 36), to Mr. Bowyer's Report (2 *L. G. B.*, p. 96), to Mr. T. B. Browne's Report (2 *L. G. B.*, p. 104), and to Dr. Clutterbuck's Report (5 *L. G. B.*, p. 152). We have already referred to these Reports, *ante*, pp. 62, 63.

[3] 21 *L. G. B.*, p. 151.

[4] 22 *L. G. B.*, p. 112.

If the workhouse schools, then, had been so successful in their depauperising influence, it may fairly be asked, Why have they been almost universally broken up? The answer is a very simple one. The improvement in 'national education' generally since the passing of the Education Act, 1870, has rendered them unnecessary. Guardians find it much more convenient in every way for themselves, and also better for the children, to send them to the public elementary schools, where for many years the education given has been equal to that given in the workhouses. The point cannot be too strongly insisted on that it has not been a contest between the workhouse school and "boarding-out," but between the former and the public elementary school. The advantages in country Unions of sending the pauper children to the elementary schools will be pointed out in another chapter.[1]

INDUSTRIAL TRAINING.

We have drawn attention to the principal weak points of the workhouse schools, which, however, it is not impossible to overcome by good management. It will be observed from the statistics we have given that in many cases the system has not been so successful with girls as with boys. The Parliamentary Return of 1861[2] showed the proportion of girls who had been returned to the workhouse on account of misconduct to be 12·6 per cent., while that of the boys was only 5·7 per cent.; the proportion of girls who had been returned from other causes being 13·3 per cent., as against 8·6 in the case of the boys. Mr. Bowyer, in commenting on this Return in 1871, accounted for the difference by the fact that most boys are apprenticed, which ensured, in the majority of cases, their not returning to the workhouse for seven years, while the girls were all sent to service, a calling in its nature precarious, and rendered more so in their case by the very early age at which they were too often sent out, before they were either mentally or physically strong enough to perform the duties expected of them by their often not over-considerate masters and mistresses. But he considers the great disadvantage under which they laboured as compared with boys to be that they received no special training for domestic service, while the boys were often taught shoemaking, tailoring, baking, and spade husbandry, so that if apprenticed to these trades or employed by a farmer, they had only to extend the knowledge they had previously acquired, instead of, as in the case with the girls, plunging at once into a sphere of duty entirely strange to them.

[1] See Chap. vi.

[2] See *ante*, p. 21.

Mr. Bowyer admitted that the training of girls (except in the department of needlework) was the weak point of workhouse education.[1]

This defect still existed in 1885, according to Dr. Clutterbuck,[2] although many Boards of Guardians were then taking steps to send out girls into the world better equipped with practical knowledge than heretofore; for few mistresses are found with the necessary patience to train young girls in practical work, however good the character of the latter may be. But while Dr. Clutterbuck rightly draws attention to this great drawback of a workhouse training, he thinks the particular defect can be easily removed, and mentions what had been done at Gloucester in providing a simple training kitchen and simple wash-house and scullery. The Shepton Mallet Guardians had also started still earlier (1880) a separate cooking kitchen for the purpose of teaching the elder girls. It was quite apart from the adults, and the matron took the superintendence of it. "We have two girls in each day," writes the master of the workhouse to Dr. Clutterbuck; "they come in early, clean the kitchener, light the fire, and prepare our own breakfast, wash up, prepare vegetables for dinner, and take part in cooking the same. Our reason for starting this is that when girls go out to service they are frequently called stupid because they are unacquainted with the names and uses of kitchen articles, whereas it is simply ignorance from not having used them."[3]

As an example of the improvement which has taken place in one particular workhouse, that of the Bedminster Union, to which Dr. Clutterbuck specially refers in his Report as having had such a large number of girls returned to the workhouse on account of their defective industrial training that the Guardians had been led to take special action in the matter,[4] we will quote the words of the present Chairman of the School Committee to show what a beneficial change has been the result of that action. He writes as follows:[5]

[1] 23 *P. L. B.*, pp. 216-217. See also 4 *L. G. B.*, p. 194. As showing what can be done with girls in a workhouse school, Mr. Mozley in 1879 mentioned the interesting fact that a girl in the Stockton Workhouse obtained during the year a first prize for sewing, open to the competition of all the girls in the town below fifteen years of age. 8 *L. G. B.*, p. xliv.

[2] 14 *L. G. B.*, p. 54.

[3] 10 *L. G. B.*, p. 180. The workhouse children are now sent out to school, but the present matron makes it a practice to have one girl give up every Saturday for instruction in the kitchen, and after a girl has passed the sixth standard she is instructed regularly in cooking until she gets a situation.

[4] 14 *L. G. B.*, p. 54, note.

[5] 16th November, 1896.

"I am unable to compare the state of things in our school now with that of twelve years ago, or with that of other institutions. The girls were declared by Mr. Longe, at a recent inspection, to 'have lost all pauper traces.' They certainly look bright and cheerful. The schoolmistress takes great interest in them; the cook trains the seniors well in the kitchen; the industrial trainer teaches them to work, to cut out and make clothes.

"I do not see how in so large an institution much more could be done to prepare them for domestic service. So far as I know, none return to the workhouse who have been trained in the school."

In 1887 Mr. Mozley describes the style of needlework done by the few girls in the small Thorne Union workhouse school as excellent, while they were not overworked. Nor did he know any school where he had seen better examples of fine needlework than the girls' school at Stockton-on-Tees.[1]

Mr. Byam Davies, in his Report for 1894 on the schools of the Midland and Eastern Districts, was unable to express himself as satisfied with the industrial training of workhouse children, notwithstanding the fact that some Boards of Guardians had interested themselves very much in the matter, and had taken care that the instruction given both to the boys and girls should be good and sufficient. But he describes the girls as being well instructed in needlework and housework.[2]

Now that there are so many voluntary associations for looking after girls who leave workhouses, so many training homes, and so many ladies on Boards of Guardians to see that they have suitable industrial training, there would seem to be no reason why the number of girls returned to workhouses from first situations should not be decreased to an infinitesimal proportion.[3]

We have already referred to the difficulty of securing proper industrial training for the children in workhouse schools, and how it arises.[4] Still, as early as 1874 Mr. T. B. Browne describes it as very good in several schools.[5]

As regards the kind of industrial training to be given to boys, opinion is divided as to whether tailoring and shoemaking are suitable occupations for them. Dr. Clutterbuck was strongly against the trades being taught, as tending to perpetuate the various forms of disease to which pauper children are hereditarily disposed. He said:

"The confinement of the tailor's and shoemaker's shop, the constrained postures, the disagreeable smells from the leather or fustian, must act unfavourably upon a naturally feeble physique. In some

[1] 17 *L. G. B.*, p. 91.

[2] 24 *L. G. B.*, p. 75.

[3] See *post*, Chap. xi.

[4] *Ante*, p. 59.

[5] 3 *L. G. B.*, p. 282.

Unions the boys are taught to bake. I do not venture to pronounce any opinion on the abstract healthiness or unhealthiness of the baker's trade, but I can scarcely think the flour-dust other than injurious to children so easily affected by cutaneous diseases, or the hot air of the bakehouse harmless to children with an hereditary tendency to consumption. Indeed, except in very few cases, I would banish these trades altogether from pauper schools. For what is our object in educating the pauper at all? Surely it is to strengthen him in mind and body, that his labour may be of real service to his country. Everything, therefore, which tends directly or indirectly to enervate the pauper child tends to perpetuate the pauper race."[1]

Mr. T. B. Browne, writing in 1867, was also of opinion that there was some disposition to overrate the importance of industrial training for very young children.

"I asked a tailor, not long since," he says, "whether he would prefer a boy twelve years old who had received some instruction in tailoring as an apprentice, to one who had received none. His answer was, that he would prefer an apprentice who had received no previous instruction, and whom he could instruct entirely himself. Sedentary employments are not desirable for young boys, but it is very important that they should acquire industrious habits at an early age, and very healthful that they should work as much as possible in the open air."[2]

Mr. Mozley has also remarked on the difficulty of finding employment for boys in the trades we are referring to,[3] and Mr. Holgate, while admitting that a knowledge of tailoring may be useful to boys who go into the army, says that in other respects the two trades are not well suited for the feeble physique of many boys, as the rooms set apart for them are often small and close, the character of the work is entirely sedentary, and the position of the workman cramped and unhealthy.[4]

Mr. Sutton, however, the experienced master of the Swinton schools, has expressed himself as favourable to the teaching of these two trades, not so much on account of their being taken up in after life, but because of the benefit which the boys receive from the training.[5]

Dr. Clutterbuck considered fresh air, vigorous exercise, good food and clothing, industrial instruction in those mechanical arts which call into healthy activity the energies of mind and body, as the essential conditions of the profitable development of pauper children. The forms, therefore, of industrial training which he advocated were firstly

[1] 6 *L. G. B.*, pp. 84, 85. Later, however, he seems to have admitted that a knowledge of shoemaking and tailoring was in fact useful in after life in many cases. See 14 *L. G. B.*, p. 53.
[2] 20 *P. L. B.*, p. 151.
[3] 16 *L. G. B.*, pp. 97, 98.
[4] 4 *L. G. B.*, p. 237.
[5] 10 *L. G. B.*, p. 176, quoted *post*, p. 91.

all *gardening and farming operations*. These should, however, include "something more than the picking up of stones in a basket, the dibbling in of potatoes, or the weeding of paths. Something of the science of agriculture should be taught the lads if the garden or the farm is to be made profitable by their labour. An ounce of brains is worth a ton of manure. Some knowledge of the chemistry of soils, the principles of the rotation of crops, the management of trees, drainage, irrigation, manures, etc., might easily be given; but of course this implies a degree of knowledge and skill seldom found in the average industrial trainer."

Secondly, he advocated *drill*. "No good school should be without an efficient drillmaster."

Thirdly, he advocated *carpentry*. "A carpenter's or joiner's shop could be made to pay. In nearly every Union there is a deficiency of adult pauper labour; such deficiency could be amply made up by the work of the elder lads."[1]

Mr. Byam Davies is of the same opinion as Dr. Clutterbuck, looking upon work in the fields and garden as far more useful than any other work that can be given to boys.[2]

Of course the efficient teaching of such trades can only be properly carried out in the large workhouse schools, but in smaller schools much might be done if the master would take one elder boy under his charge and teach him some of the more advanced points of garden work, such as taking cuttings, budding roses, planting and potting, watering flowers, etc. Mr. Holgate in his 1874 Report says:

"In the only school in which I have found this plan thoroughly carried out, the boys so taught are snapped up immediately by the neighbouring families; and as there are but few Unions in which the master does not take a pride in his flowers, and often even finds a corner for a small greenhouse, there would be no difficulty in carrying it out more frequently. I think also that a system of school gardens both for vegetables and flowers might be devised without much difficulty, and would meet with the best possible results, both physically and morally. The selection of a fitting man as farm bailiff or gardener is of the greatest importance, as in addition to his own practical ability in working the land to the best advantage, it is necessary that he should be able to keep the boys placed under him well up to their work, and to make them put good honest labour into it, and not allow them to shirk as many are apt to do, and accomplish the looking on to their heart's content whilst their master toils."

With girls there should be no such difficulty. Where the matrons of the workhouses devote themselves to the work, and really endeavour to

[1] 6 *L. G. B.*, pp. 85, 86.
[2] 12 *L. G. B.*, p. 109; 13 *L. G. B.*, p. 131.

bring the girls up well, they can be taught the usual duties of domestic service very easily, and never come back to the workhouse when they have once found a place.[1]

It must not be forgotten that it is part of the duties of the matron of a workhouse "to assist the schoolmistress in training up the children so as best to fit them for service."[2]

Mr. Holgate, in his Report for 1874, refers to a Union where the matron had carried out this duty "with great energy and corresponding success."[3]

"She has formed a class of her own, numbering about twelve of the girls of fourteen and upwards, whom she instructs thoroughly in all branches of domestic service, and by them, and them alone, the whole of the cooking, washing, and ironing of the Union is carried out; they are carefully kept from any of the adult women in the house, they sleep in a detached bedroom, wear a neat simple dress and cap similar to that of a house or kitchenmaid in private service, and each in turn has the opportunity of learning the smaller details of their duties by waiting on the master and matron, laying their table, and washing their china; during the time of training they do not attend school, but the master sees that they have books, and do not forget what they have learnt in school."

Mr. Holgate thinks that Boards of Guardians might well press for a closer attention to this Article on the part of matrons, and they would find a few months' training of the kind he describes for girls who have reached the age of fourteen pay them far better than the plan of sending them out to service at that age, with often too little knowledge of the character of the first mistress to whom the children are sent, or of the quality or amount of work to which they are put.[4]

EDUCATION.

We have already referred to the better results which are now obtained from the education given in workhouse schools.[5]

As early as 1871 Mr. T. B. Browne drew attention to improvement in this respect. He said:

"In proof, not merely of what is practicable, but of what is actully done in a workhouse, I give the results of a very recent inspection of the school at Liskeard, in Cornwall. Out of thirty boys present twenty-seven read the Acts of the Apostles well and distinctly, and passed a good religious examination; the same number could write well, and sixteen wrote a sentence from dictation without a single mistake; twenty-five worked sums correctly in arithmetic in different rules, ten of

[1] 12 *L. G. B.*, p. 109.
[2] 4 *L. G. B.*, p. 237.
[3] Order of the 24th July, 1847, Art. 210, No. 3.
[4] *Ibid.*
[5] Introductory chapter.

whom worked a sum in practice; twenty-three passed an intelligent examination in geography, and fourteen in English history and grammar. Twenty-five girls and infants present, taught by a schoolmistress, passed generally a creditable examination, though less advanced than the boys. It is not probable that these results can be often exceeded elsewhere. I apprehend that there cannot be many national schools where nine-tenths of the boys can read and write well, and where five-sixths would prove correct in arithmetic, the majority in the compound and higher rules. Liskeard is not a solitary place. In the Hereford, Atcham, Bristol, Clifton, Truro, Great Boughton, Stroud, and many other workhouses, the state of education is very satisfactory, and two Shropshire workhouses, Wem and Church Stretton, may be mentioned as proofs that much may be accomplished with a small number of children."[1]

In 1882 Mr. Byam Davies reports upon the writing and arithmetic of the workhouse children in his district as being in general decidedly good, but that the children in the upper standards, though reading fluently enough, seemed to do so without intelligence, not having the least notion of the meanings of the more unusual words which they met with in their books. "In very few of the schools," he says, "have they advanced beyond the most simple elements, and though at some I was surprised and pleased with the knowledge displayed of geography, and even, in one or two cases, of English history, in far the greater number of cases the children did not even know the chief towns and rivers of the British Islands."[2] He refers in a later Report[3] to the one great difficulty in training the children to read intelligently, arising from the fact of their confinement in the workhouse, and their consequent want of opportunity of seeing and hearing about the common things of everyday life, and of associating with grown-up people. "Could the quality of the reading," he continued, "be brought up to the proper standard, I believe that elementary education in workhouse schools would be little, if at all, inferior to that given in National and Board Schools, and would at all events be sufficient for its purpose, and as good as can be expected to be given entirely at the expense of the public."[4]

In 1885 Dr. Clutterbuck is found writing to the same effect as regards *reading*, which—in the matter of distinct articulation and

[1] 23 *P. L. B.*, p. 231. In 1868 Mr. Bowyer stated that workhouse schools would probably surpass the elementary schools of the time in the proportion of the number of children out of the total number on the books who attained proficiency. See 20 *P. L. B.*, p. 141.
[2] 11 *L. G. B.*, p. 137.
[3] 12 *L. G. B.*, pp. 108, 109.
[4] The above was, of course, written before Free Education was established in the Public Elementary Schools.

correct pronunciation—was the worst feature of a workhouse education. On the other hand, he says:

"In some few schools, especially in Wales, the reading is excellent—spirited, clear, and very intelligent. Of original composition very little is of course attempted, although here and there I have met with specimens that would do credit to children of a very different social grade. In most schools there is a very praiseworthy effort made to encourage recitation, though here again the efforts meet with very partial success. The poetry is for the most part monotonously drawled out, the rhymes unnecessarily accentuated, and the prepositions nearly always made emphatic. It is very difficult to effect a reform herein, as the teachers are too often themselves examples of the faults they ought to check. But good reading is, after all, in all grades of society a rare accomplishment, and it is perhaps useless to expect it in the lower ranks. There are, however, in the matter of recitation some very bright exceptions, and I think the recitation of some pauper children (in the Birkenhead Schools for example) might fearlessly challenge comparison with some of the very best utterances of our public schools. There has been, I am glad to remark, a very decided increase in the number of the passes this year in the higher standards, and in a few cases what are termed the 'specific subjects' have been taught with marked success. Pupils from Hereford Union Schools have gained prizes and certificates from South Kensington for a knowledge of agriculture and for proficiency in drawing in a proportion exceeding that of all the neighbouring schools. In the infant department, attached to most of the lower schools, the kindergarten system is gradually being adopted with very beneficial results. An admirable example of the good to be derived from this system (when the teacher is something more than a mere machine) is presented by the infant school of the Cardiff Union."[1]

Mr. Mozley more than once in his reports expresses the doubt whether the intellect, and still more the soul of the children is vitally touched by the course of instruction they receive, but acknowledges that that is a thing of which the manifestations must by the nature of the case be rare, and as to which traces of improvement can only be ascertained with difficulty. "Moreover, the shortness of the time during which many of the children remain in the schools is a great impediment to the growth of slow-growing influences, and still more to the observation of them by outsiders. Yet real intellectual interest in the things around them is frequently shown by the boys; by the girls more rarely. Also one may conclude from the letters written by the children after they have left the schools, that the deeper springs of character have sometimes been touched in them by their education there."[2]

So far as statistics are to be trusted, the results of the education given in workhouse schools show a great improvement. Mr. Byam

[1] 14 *L. G. B.*, p. 52. [2] 16 *L. G. B.*, p. 94. See also 9 *L. G. B.*, p. 208.

Davies, Inspector for the Midland and Eastern District, has tabulated these results since 1882, and the following table is compiled from his Reports for 1882–83 and 1894–95.[1]

	1882–83.		1894–95.	
	Number of children.	Percentage of passes.	Number of children.	Percentage of passes.
Children presented for Examination in the six different standards . . .	3531 ... —		2132 ... —	
Passed in Reading . . .	3114 ...	88	1957 ...	91
,, Writing . . .	2539 ...	72	1892 ...	88
,, Arithmetic . . .	2499 ...	71	1741 ...	81

Mr. Mozley's Reports testify to the same improvement in the Northern District, the following table being compiled from his Reports for 1881–82 and 1892–93.[2]

	1881–82.		1892–93.	
	Number of children.	Percentage of passes.	Number of children.	Percentage of passes.
Children presented for Examination in the six different Standards . . .	5261 ... —		5262 ... —	
Passed in Reading . . .	4848 ...	92	4971 ...	94
,, Writing . . .	4072 ...	77	4586 ...	85
,, Arithmetic . . .	3641 ...	70	4263 ...	81

The effect of the new Order on the "Instruction of Children"[3] may be to secure better *educational* results in Poor Law Schools, but will render it still more difficult than it was before to secure efficient *industrial* training.

HEALTH OF THE CHILDREN.

It might be imagined from what we have said with regard to the monotony of the life of children in a workhouse school that they would not be healthy. The facts do not seem to support the supposition. In 1881 Dr. Clutterbuck was able to state, on the authority of the medical officers, that in nearly every school (127 in number) in the Western District the health of the children was decidedly good, there having been in only twenty-seven of them any epidemic of a character sufficiently serious to interfere with the instruction of the children.[4] Again, in 1885 Mr. Mozley reports that "the number

[1] 12 *L. G. B.*, p. 108, and 24 *L. G. B.*, p. 75. The decrease in the numbers of the children is, of course, accounted for by the closing of many workhouse schools since 1882, and by the children having been sent to the public elementary schools.

[2] 11 *L. G. B.*, p. 104, and 22 *L. G. B.*, p. 103. Our reason for taking the figures for these years is that the year 1881–82 is the first year for which Mr. Mozley gives a table, while after the year 1892–93 North Wales was added to his district.

[3] See Appendix E., p. 405.

[4] Dr. Clutterbuck appends to his Report a very interesting return on this subject. 10 *L. G. B.*, p. 178.

of children withdrawn by reason of sickness from the inspection in the schools inspected by myself was 319. It will be seen that the total number of the children in the workhouse schools in my district on the day of inspection was 7701, so that the number of sick children was almost exactly four and one-seventh per cent. of the total number, which certainly is a small proportion, and creditable to the schools from the point of view of health, especially when it is considered that the children are naturally below the average, physically speaking."[1]

DISCIPLINE.

The discipline of a workhouse school is provided for by the General Order of 1847. Under this Order the schoolmaster or schoolmistress are "to regulate the discipline and arrangements of the school, and the industrial and moral training of the children, subject to the direction of the Guardians."[2] They are "to accompany the children when they quit the workhouse for exercise, or for attendance at public worship, unless the Guardians shall otherwise direct," and "to keep the children clean in their persons, and orderly and decorous in their conduct."[3]

Half an hour after the ringing of the bell for rising, they are required to call over the names of the children, and to inspect them.[4]

As to punishments (1) no child under twelve years of age may be confined in a dark room or during the night; and (2) no corporal punishment may be inflicted on any female child, and if a male child is so punished the punishment must not take place until two hours after the commission of the offence, it must be by the schoolmaster or master, and by means of such a rod or instrument as has been approved by the Guardians or by the Visiting Committee.[5]

But no male child over fourteen years of age can be *flogged*, and whatever the kind of corporal punishment may be both master and schoolmaster must, if it is possible, be present.

A TYPE OF A WORKHOUSE SCHOOL.

Before concluding this chapter, a short account of a small workhouse school (with about forty children, twenty-two boys and twenty girls) may be of interest. This school is actually part of the workhouse, standing in front of the main buildings, but entered through the workhouse gate. On one side of the path leading to the school building is the girls' playground, and on the other side, the boys'. The children were at play as we walked up to the door, the boys at cricket, and the girls with skipping-ropes and other amusements.

[1] 14 *L. G. B.*, p. 47. [2] Art. 212, No. 2. [3] *Ibid.*, No. 3 and No. 4.
[4] Art. 103. [5] Articles 136–139.

Their voices sounded very merry. The school is under the control of the master of the workhouse, and there is one schoolmistress, who has charge of both boys and girls. The matron assists in the training of the children. The children can be visited once a month by their friends, and they have their toys and a small library. Boys and girls go out together for walks three times a week in the summer, and in the winter as often as the weather permits. The elder boys have their garden allotments, which are a great interest to them, and they can work in these just as they like every afternoon in the week. They play cricket in the workhouse fields, and have matches with other schools. The majority of the boys learn to play in a band with a view of joining the army bands. Both boys and girls go out to Sunday School, and they are often sent out on errands for things, being given money to pay for them.

The training given to the girls is such that there is a great demand for them for service, as for a year or eighteen months before being sent out they are individually trained to do house work in the matron's own rooms under her own eye. The matron is very careful as to the kind of place a girl goes to, always going herself to see it first, and she keeps a watch over them, visiting them now and then for six or seven years after their leaving the school. She has never known a case of failure since she has been matron at the workhouse, the girls never coming back to her, and she has occupied the position for seven years. The only difficulty she has is connected with the "ins and outs," the bane of all Poor Law Schools, and especially of small ones. Both boys and girls are isolated for three or four days, however, before they are drafted into the school.

This particular workhouse is by no means an isolated instance, and it is only when the workhouse schools have vanished altogether that the nation will appreciate what a great part they have taken in the work of depauperisation. It is at least doubtful, as we have shown, whether either the systems of sending workhouse children to outside schools and of boarding-out, which are rapidly supplanting the workhouse schools, will show any better results.

At any rate, there is nothing to justify the abuse of these schools, which is nowadays so frequently heard. When it is considered with what unpromising material they have had to deal, they have produced results which the best educational establishments in the country might be proud to equal, and it is sad to see "the statements made and too generally accepted which are as ill-founded as they are cruel in their injustice and untruth."[1]

[1] 25 *L. G. B.*, p. 195.

CHAPTER III.

DISTRICT AND SEPARATE SCHOOLS

IN this and the following chapter we shall deal with that class of Poor Law Schools to which the epithet of "barrack" has come to be applied on account of the children being aggregated together in *large* numbers in barrack-like buildings.[1] According to the report of the Departmental Committee on Metropolitan Poor Law Schools, the "barrack" schools of London range in size from the "separate" school at Tooting with 174 children to the "district" school at Brighton Road, Sutton, with 1541 children. In the provinces the largest separate school is at Swinton (Manchester Union), with about 750 children, and the smallest is at Hartismere with thirty-eight children, while the four district schools have 105, 150, 169, and 220 children respectively. The main difference between the class of school we refer to in this chapter and workhouse schools is that they are all under superintendents who are entirely free from the control of the workhouse masters, although, as we have seen, certain workhouse schools detached from the workhouses are also under separate superintendents.[2] Where this is the case these "detached" schools may fairly be considered as in all respects "separate" schools, and therefore coming within the scope of the present chapter.

Mr. Bowyer, who was a strong advocate of the establishment of district schools all over the country, looked upon the consolidation of workhouse schools as the only means by which educational progress could be made. He said that during the four years after 1847, when workhouse schools were first placed under inspection, their improvement both as to instruction and industrial training was very considerable, but that with the year 1852 the stationary period commenced which had continued up to 1871.

[1] Mr. Ernest Hart claims the credit for the invention of the term "barrack school," and we are not in the least inclined to deprive him of the honour. See evidence before the Poor Law Schools Committee. Q. 15.

[2] Such are the detached schools at Nottingham, Ormskirk, Flimby, Chesterfield, Merthyr Tydfil, etc.

"The reason for this immobility is that whatever progress had been previously made (and it was not inconsiderable) was due simply to the examination of the teachers and the inspection of the schools, and that these agencies had by that time produced the full amount of benefit which was permitted to them by the system according to which pauper education has been, and still mainly is, carried on—a system which appears to me as inefficient for the education and training of the children brought up in workhouses as it is costly to the country.

"The defects of the present organization of pauper education are the necessary consequence of its origin. At the time when the existing system of Poor Law administration was instituted, upwards of thirty years ago, the value of education as a means of stemming the flood of pauperism then deluging the country was not so fully recognized as it is at present. The schools were consequently not formed with the single view of educating the children in the most economical as well as the most efficient manner in order that they might not grow up to be paupers.

"The school was considered as a mere adjunct to the workhouse; a room in the house devoted to the instruction of the children of indoor paupers, just as a room is set apart in a private house for the instruction of the children of the family. This is the cause of the anomalies in the system of workhouse education to which I have often adverted in former reports. For example, the Committee of Council of Education would not have recognized, either for building grants or for annual grants, a school containing so insignificant a number as less than twenty children; yet of such schools there are more than sixty in my district. Neither would that Committee have recognized a school of between twenty and thirty children; yet there are about seventy of that size in my district. All these schools are chiefly supported by public money, as the salaries of the teachers paid out of the Parliamentary grant form the principal cost of their maintenance. From such anomalies, of which the above examples are an illustration, have flowed consequences that materially detract from the utility of the education received by workhouse children, and have arrested the improvement impressed upon it by inspection."[1]

We have quoted Mr. Bowyer at length because of his long experience as an Inspector of Education, and also because it enables one to understand how the formation of school districts[2] and the

[1] 1 *L. G. B.*, p. 224.

[2] The district school system may be said to have held the field in official circles so late as 1877, when the last school district, viz., that of Brentwood, was formed. For fifteen years, then, from the time (1861) when the Royal Commission on Education reported in its favour, the Central Authority had been urging its adoption as by far the best way of dealing with pauper children, and for fifteen years Guardians (though not always influenced by the highest motives) had been as steadily resisting its imposition upon them. (See *e.g.* 20 *P. L. B.*, p. 145; 21 *P. L. B.*, p. 103; 22 *P. L. B.*, pp. 121–123; 1 *L. G. B.*, pp. 222, 231; 5 *L. G. B.*, p. 138; and 6 *L. G. B.*, p. 96). The Metropolitan Poor Act of 1867 caused the London Unions to adopt the system, but it never "took" in the provinces. The Brentwood District

establishment of large schools came to be advocated. At the time he wrote boarding-out was in its infancy and mistrusted, while Board Schools to which the workhouse children could be sent had not yet been established, and the education given in the Village Schools was lamentably deficient.

Just as Mr. Bowyer emphasises the weak points of workhouse schools, so Mr. Wodehouse stated the arguments used in favour of "district" and "separate" schools in his Report of the 31st December, 1869,[1] as follows:

"The reasons for which I myself advocate the erection of separate schools in all the large towns, and the formation of school districts in less populous places, are, first, that it is desirable to remove the children from workhouses in which the mere presence of adult inmates, apart from the question of contamination, familiarises their minds with an idea of the place to which they can return in after life whenever they find a difficulty in getting their own living, and thus renders it more difficult than it would otherwise be to implant in them habits of industry and self-reliance; secondly, because a far more thorough industrial training can be imparted to them in separate and district schools, and one more calculated to enable them to get their living in after life, either in farm service, in the army, navy, or mercantile marine, or in various kinds of handicraft; and thirdly, because this system would afford at a comparatively small expense a thoroughly good education to the children of the smaller workhouses, where the scanty numbers in attendance render it impossible to secure the services of competent teachers, and where the education which is given is at once costly and inefficient."

As concerns "district" and "separate" schools, it was alleged that a certain superiority existed with the former in regard to their management. Mr. Carleton Tufnell, the great apostle of district schools, stated the argument as follows:[2]

"Every pauper school established by a Union or single parish is necessarily managed by the Guardians of such Union or parish, who are elected mainly for the purpose of superintending the workhouse, and directing the distribution of outdoor relief. Their appointment has no special reference to education or the arrangements, often necessarily very complex, of boarding schools, and hence they often take little interest in the instruction of pauper children, and sometimes grievously mismanage them. I do not mean to say that this is universally true. Nothing can be better managed than the school of the Stepney Union, and there are other instances of similar successful management. But these cases are exceptional, and on consideration

above referred to (which combined the two Unions of Hackney and Shoreditch) was dissolved in 1885, Hackney taking over the existing schools for itself, and Shoreditch establishing the Hornchurch Cottage Homes.

[1] 22 *P. L. B.*, p. 135. [2] 20 *P. L. B.*, p. 131.

it will be obvious that they must be so. What probability is there that persons elected for a particular purpose shall be equally well qualified to serve an entirely different purpose? Is it likely that gentlemen chosen to manage the poor rates should be able to conduct the by no means easy business of arranging a large boarding school, where, in addition to the ordinary intellectual instruction common to all schools, means must be provided for the children's physical and industrial training and placing them in permanent situations?

"A district school, however, belongs to several Unions or district parishes, and the managers are selected by each set of Guardians from the component Unions or parishes for the express purpose of superintending the school. Now a Board of Guardians will generally contain two or three individuals who take special interest in the subject of education, and such persons naturally get elected to the District School Board, and it must be obvious that a Board so chosen must have superior qualifications for school management. But this is not all: each set of Guardians may elect any ratepayer who is rated to a specified amount, and is not confined to a selection from its own body; and what is more important still, the Board so elected may, by order of the Poor Law Board, be elected for three years instead of one, as in the case of ordinary Guardians. Gentlemen elected to office for one year often cease to hold office, when at the end of the year they have become acquainted with the duties by experience.

"In schools belonging to single Unions I have often had to lament the absence of gentlemen who had thus become experienced in school management, but whose year of office being ended were not re-elected. I am convinced by experience of the great superiority of triennial to annual elections in procuring fitting members to fill these offices."

The same inspector was convinced that no plan for the education of pauper children could equal in efficiency that of large schools, whether "district" or "separate."[1]

He considered that this was the plan which accorded best with the principles laid down for dealing with pauper children, which he stated as follows:[2]

1. The children ought never to be reared with adult paupers.
2. They should always be brought up industrially.
3. They should be instructed by efficient teachers.
4. The classification, and therefore the instruction, is more effectually carried out in large than in small schools.
5. It is proportionally cheaper to feed and superintend large than small numbers.
6. No school can be maintained in a state of efficiency in which the teachers are continually changing.

[1] 20 *P. L. B.*, pp. 131, 156; 23 *P. L. B.*, pp. 206, 207.
[2] 1 *L.G.B.*, p. 215.

7. The chances of a pauper child earning an independent livelihood are proportional to the distance of its removal, when launched into the world, from its own low relations and haunts of vice, among which it has probably passed several years of its life.

(1) *The Separation from Adult Paupers.*

As to the first condition—the separation from the adult paupers—no one will deny that this is effected by the system we are considering.[1]

(2) *Industrial Training.*

As to the second condition—the securing of industrial training—there will not be much difference of opinion on the subject with respect to the boys, and, as Mr. Tufnell said, the training of boys in music and seamanship is all but unattainable under any other system. "It is impossible," he wrote in 1870, "to introduce into small schools the industries that are found to be most successful in training boys. Carpentry, blacksmithery, engineering, cannot be introduced into small schools, from the impossibility of finding the work on which to practise the boys, and the expense of paying the instructors. But preparing boys for the musical service of the army and navy has been found to be by far the most successful industry. In the boys' school under my inspection 277 boys have been disposed of in this way during 1870. Now this industry is unsuitable to any day school, or to any pauper school with less than 100 to 150 boys, the schools that are still larger being most successful in training musicians."[2]

By 1867 every Metropolitan school had its band, taught by an efficient bandmaster. The demand for boys who knew how to read music, had acquired a good mastery of their instruments, and were well practised in playing in concert, was soon found to be very great, while their playing had contributed to the order and discipline of the schools in a marked degree. The bands were exceedingly popular among the children, and had a great effect in softening and humanising them.[3]

These boys invariably gave the utmost satisfaction, some of them being selected to be trained as bandmasters. From one school alone, that belonging to St. George's in the East, ninety musicians were

[1] See 5 *L.G.B.*, p. 156.

[2] 23 *P. L. B.*, p. 206. To Mr. Tufnell's Report is appended a list of these 277 boys and how they had been disposed of (*ibid.*, pp. 210–214). Mr. Wodehouse was also in favour of large schools, on account of the good industrial training which could be given in them. See 20 *P. L. B.*, p. 156.

[3] 20 *P. L. B.*, pp. 132–133.

enlisted into army bands during five years, every one of whom had turned out well.[1]

In 1884 Mr. Holgate notices the same satisfactory results which had led to the salaries of the skilled bandmasters appointed to instruct the boys being paid in full out of the Parliamentary grant instead of being charged upon the Poor Rates.[2]

This musical training is also praised by the Poor Law Schools Committee, who testify to its beneficial results.[3]

Next after musical training Mr. Tufnell placed training in seamanship, which offered then, as it does now, a good opening for boys. He was much impressed with the Mettray system, like every one who has visited the institution there, and would have liked to see a full-sized model of a ship erected on the premises of each school. The experience of Mettray had shown that it was quite possible to train boys to be three parts sailors on dry land. Mr. Tufnell alleged that captains of ships preferred boys so trained to any others, and some of them had informed him that they would rather have a boy so trained fourteen years of age than a finer boy of sixteen untrained, the training advancing the boys two years in the profession of a sailor. He described the success which the Stepney Guardians had met with after adopting this mode of making sailors.

"Many years ago," he says, "the Guardians were in the habit of paying £10 premium to captains of vessels who would take their boys to sea; but, determining to train their boys for the sea service, they spent a considerable sum in erecting a full-sized ship in the playground, fully equipping it with sails, rigging, etc., causing the sailor's class to sleep in hammocks, and engaging a seaman to instruct the class in sea matters. Nothing could answer better. Captains eagerly engaged these boys *without* premium, and in five years this school sent 183 boys to sea."[4]

The little difficulty which Guardians met with in disposing of their boys seems to have been the reason of their unwillingness to incur the expense of the erection and fitting up of such ships, but Mr. Tufnell gives two reasons for the proposal. (1) That it was an object of national importance to increase the number of sailors, and that a great benefit would be thereby conferred on the country, and (2) that sea service was peculiarly well fitted for the class of children who came under the control of the Guardians. On the second point he said:

"All persons who have had much experience in pauper schools are well aware that when the children are launched into the world

[1] 21 *P. L. B.*, p. 87.

[2] 14 *L. G. B.*, p. 56.

[3] Report, p. 47.

[4] 20 *P. L. B.*, p. 133.

it is of the utmost importance that they should see as little of their relations as possible. If a well-trained pauper boy fails to become independent, or falls into crime and misery, in nine cases out of ten the cause may be traced to the influence of pauper parents or relations. Remove him from this influence, and he is almost certain to turn out well. I believe this conclusion to be sanctioned by unimpeachable evidence.

"Now boys engaged in the army or navy are at once removed from the evil influences I have alluded to. They have a certain occupation for fourteen or fifteen years, are during that time kept under proper tutelage, which is specially desirable in the case of these friendless youths, earn good wages, and, as experience shows, almost invariably give the greatest satisfaction to their superiors. If I had my will I would bring up every pauper boy to be a musician for the army or navy bands, or to be a sailor for the royal navy or merchant service.

"The school belonging to the Stepney Union is the only one that has completely carried out my ideas on this subject. In that establishment the boys are allowed to choose their own occupations, and ninety-five per cent. volunteer for the Royal Navy or Merchant Service. The London pauper schools alone could, if furnished with the above described appliances,[1] turn out about 400 sailors annually. They would all be able to read or write well, to understand all the parts of a ship, to mount aloft without hesitation, most of them to swim and dive, and, if necessary, they shall all be instructed in the theory and management of a steam engine, and to stoke, there being a steam engine in most of the schools. Surely such a result must be of some national importance."[2]

At the time to which we are referring (1870), and also at the present time, the other chief occupations in which boys were employed were shoemaking, tailoring, employment on the land, and under the carpenter, smith, engineer, and bricklayer, and in general household cleaning.

Dr. Bridges was, and still is, a great advocate for employment on the land in preference to any other occupation, and quotes the motto of the Mettray founder, *améliorer la terre par l'homme, et l'homme par la terre*, as one that has every motive of experience and common sense to recommend it. He pointed to the physical vigour and longevity of agricultural labourers, even when underfed, and to the favourable effects on the health of the children wherever this employment was largely practised.[3]

He admitted, however, that it was not always easy to find places for boys trained simply as farm labourers, unless it were thought well

[1] Mr. Tufnell thought that the Admiralty might well pay the cost of erecting and furnishing the ships.

[2] 20 *P. L. B.*, p. 134. See also 21 *P. L. B.*, p. 87; 23 *P. L. B.*, p. 207.

[3] 3 *L. G. B.*, p. 229.

to establish a stream of emigration to one or more of our colonies, but he anticipated that the demand for them would be inexhaustible.

He also advocated skilled gardening, in which the youngest children, outside the limits of infancy, could be employed out of doors, and which would train the faculties of observation better than most things learnt in schoolrooms.[1]

At the time he wrote his Report about 400 boys, or one-fifth of the total number of boys who underwent industrial training, were employed in field or garden work; 289 were employed in shoemaking; 303 in tailoring; 72 in the blacksmiths' or engineers' shops; and 81 as carpenters and bricklayers.[2]

Mr. Birchall, the head-master of the Kirkdale Schools, held Dr. Bridges' views. "I think," he said, "that the best and only suitable industrial work for our boys is the cultivation of the soil, as it would best strengthen and develop their constitution, not of course to train them to be farmers, etc., but to give them muscle."[3]

With regard to employing the boys in shoemaking and tailoring, Mr. Tufnell thought these trades the worst in which they could be brought up. He said it was impossible to instruct them in a school to do anything better than slop work, so that when launched into the world they could only earn the lowest wages, and in towns frequently became applicants for relief.[4]

Mr. Sutton, the head-master of the Swinton Schools, however, thought more favourably of the effect produced on the boys themselves by learning tailoring, shoemaking, etc. "Although," he said, "the boys are frequently put to trades which they do not follow in after life, I still consider the training here has been, and will prove, distinctly beneficial to them afterwards. Indeed I have heard young men, former inmates, express the opinion decidedly." Mr. Mozley, from whose Report we are quoting, adds that it must not be supposed from Mr. Sutton's commendation of the educational results of tailoring and shoemaking in the Poor Law Schools, that Swinton is deficient in field labour; as a fact nearly every boy is employed on the farm for two half-days weekly, with very good results.[5]

At Swinton the boys now receive instruction in ambulance classes. Mr. Mozley says he saw them binding up broken heads, broken thighs, broken legs (*i.e.*, of boys who were supposed to have suffered from these accidents), and carrying off the broken-legged patients on stretchers.[6]

[1] 3 *L. G. B.*, p. 230. [2] *Ibid.* [3] 10 *L. G. B.*, p. 176.
[4] 20 *P. L. B.*, p. 132. See also *Ibid.*, p. 151.
[5] 10 *L. G. B.*, p. 176. [6] 24 *L. G. B.*, p. 69.

The Guardians of the Newport Union (Monmouthshire) employ a County Council lecturer to instruct the boys at the Ely Schools in tree-planting and grafting.[1]

As showing further what is being done in the large London schools in the way of real technical education for the boys, Mr. Wyndham Holgate writes in 1889 as follows:[2]

"At the South Metropolitan Schools at Sutton three capital workshops have been provided, in which the trades of carpenter, tailor, and shoemaker are thoroughly taught in all their branches to large classes of boys, with very promising results, whilst the old shops, in which the cobbling, the patching, and the repairs for the premises are done, continue to be maintained by a less advanced class. In the St. Pancras Schools at Leavesden excellent work is being effected in the engineers' shop, from which a large number of boys are getting first-rate positions at the Royal Arsenal and elsewhere; whilst in October last, two of the lads, not yet 15, gained the first and second certificates of merit for amateur turning at the Exhibition of the Turners' Company. Their medals were presented to them at the Mansion House by the Lord Mayor, and on the occasion Mr. T. T. Holtzapfel, one of the judges, said that although the exhibits were few in number, they were better than usual, while in finish and form they stood pre-eminent over those shown in the previous twenty exhibitions."

The weak side of the large school system shows itself in the industrial training of girls. Their occupations are naturally less varied than those of the boys, and are practically limited to general charing, needle, kitchen, and laundry work, the training being directed to fitting them for household service. Their industrial training in the district schools is, however, so far as it goes, well spoken of, and was long ago stated to be infinitely superior to what they would receive in a labourer's cottage or in elementary schools.[3] And that this is true at the present time must be known to all who are acquainted with village life. Mr. Mozley, in his Report for 1890, mentions that the instruction in cooking in the Swinton Schools was particularly good and useful; twelve girls were then learning the art daily, and about sixty had lessons twice a week.[4] In most of the Metropolitan schools the elder girls are taught to cook in the ordinary way in which cooking is done in small middle-class homes. They cook for the officers and for the matron, and also for the infirmary under domestic trainers. Thus, as early as 1867, the Central London

[1] 24 *L. G. B.*, p. 67.
[2] 19 *L. G. B.*, p. 156. The Central London School at Hanwell took steps in the same direction at this time. See 20 *L. G. B.*, p. 281.
[3] See *e.g.* Mr. Bowyer's Report for 1875 (4 *I. C. R.* p. 197).
[4] 20 *L. G. B.*, p. 266.

District School is mentioned as excelling in its methods of training plain cooks—a class of servant for which there is always a good demand.[1]

At Swinton the older girls attend cooking classes in Manchester, besides doing practical work of this kind at the schools, and the Guardians of the Cardiff Union employ the services of a public lecturer on cookery to give lessons to the girls at the Ely Schools once a week, and Mr. Mozley testifies to the interest of a lesson at which he was present.[2]

Mr. Sutton, the head-master of the Swinton Schools, admitted that the household work of the girls laboured under disadvantages, being in a large institution; but he said that it had the advantage of giving them a high model. He was of opinion that with proper care there was but little detriment, if any, to the children. Fire-lighting, black-leading grates, scrubbing floors, bed-making, and sundry other household duties, which were the bulk of the duties a girl of thirteen or under could do, were all done there and taught well. Cooking, fire ironing, in fact, advanced household work, was all that was not well taught; but then that was difficult to teach to a school girl of tender years.[3]

Mr. Tufnell has told us that he was always asking the question from the superintendents of the schools whether there was any difficulty in finding employment for either boys or girls, and the uniform answer was that they could not supply the demand. For domestic servants especially the demand was so pressing that in one of the large district schools he was informed that there were six applications for every girl that could be recommended for service. The applicants came from all parts of England, and even from Scotland.[4] If this was the case so early as 1868, it is much more the case now; and with regard to the situations obtained for the girls from the London schools, the Metropolitan Association for Befriending Young Servants sees that they are good ones, where the girls are likely to be well looked after and happy.

Most of the suggestions made by Mrs. Nassau Senior in her valuable Report of 1874 on Metropolitan Pauper Girls[5] are now carried out in all the large London schools in conjunction with the M. A. B. Y. S., of which admirable society she was the founder, and that so few of the girls fail in after life is strong evidence in favour of the education and training which they receive.

[1] 20 *P. L. B.*, p. 132. See also 23 *L. G. B.*, p. 154.
[2] 24 *L. G. B.*, p. 67.
[3] 10 *L. G. B.*, p. 176.
[4] 21 *P. L. B.*, p. 89.
[5] 3 *L. G. B.*, pp. 311-394.

As to what was being done in provincial Poor Law Schools at the time Mrs. Nassau Senior wrote, Dr. Clutterbuck gives in his Report for 1876 an account of the industrial training given at the Carleon separate schools (with about 170 children) of the Newport Union.[1]

Vocal Music. Singing in parts at sight on the tonic sol-fa method. The children can sing several concerted pieces from Mendelssohn and others.

Instrumental Music. There are twenty-four boys in the regular band who can play moderately difficult music at sight, besides a number of learners coming on.

Needlework. The whole of the girls' clothing is made on the premises, together with the boys' shirts, and all the mending and darning.

Physical Education. A regular system following Maclaren's book, including so far: Movements and positions, dumb-bells, leaping, with graduated standards and bar; use of leaping-pole, horizontal bar. There is a set of parallel bars in preparation. The boys have won several cricket matches, and every game of football they have played.

Gardening. There are nearly fourteen acres of land entirely managed by the boys under the supervision of the bailiff. The garden, notwithstanding the unfavourable season, is now in excellent condition, and was much praised by the School Committee at their last visit. Several of the members of the Committee are large farmers. There are five cows on the premises at present (another will shortly be bought). Eight girls can milk and churn, as also eight boys.

Miscellaneous. Every girl can scrub and wash clothes (according to her strength). Many of them can do a little cooking and ironing. The elder girls are put, by turns, to do all the work they would be required to do in any respectable service.

In all the large schools nowadays a practical training is given to the girls to fit them for service. As early as 1886 Mr. Holgate noted an advance in this respect in several of the London schools.

"In these schools," he writes,[2] "there is a domestic training class for six or more girls, who by age and school progress are next in the list for going out to service. These six girls live in a separate set of apartments in the infants' block, with kitchen, laundry, etc. attached, under the charge of a special officer; two being cooks, two house and parlourmaids, and two general servants. The average time for

[1] 6 *L. G. B.*, p. 87.

[2] Mr. Holgate mentions specially, Forest Gate, Anerley, and Leavesden. See 16 *L. G. B.*, p. 112.

each girl under instruction is about four months, and each has two weeks in rotation at each kind of duty.

"The new and most interesting point in the system, as carried out at Forest Gate, is that the girls who are on duty as cooks are sent daily to the shops in the neighbourhood of the schools to market for their provisions, all articles, quantities and prices being duly entered by them in books given them for the purpose, and thus bringing into practical proof their capacity to work a 'bill of parcels' sum correctly, breaking them in to the use of the value of money as coin, and to the daily requirements of a small household, and giving them self-reliance, which will be of good service to them when they go out into the world to earn their bread."

Mr. Holgate goes on to suggest that the system should be extended to the purchase of the materials for their outfit, by which the girls "would gain a knowledge of the quality and price of plain articles, and the quantity required to make their various garments, and be educated to exercise a sound judgment as to the colours and style of dress befitting their future position in life."

At Hanwell, Forest Gate, and Edmonton, cookery classes have been organized under the instruction of a peripatetic technical instructor and demonstrator with very satisfactory results, and in two or three cases the Metropolitan School Managers, realising that the training provided for the girls in their large schools is not a very suitable preparation for domestic service, arrange for some of the elder girls to live in a separate portion of the building as in a home of their own, which is fitted up as an ordinary dwelling-house. In other schools they serve with a similar object for three months in the houses of the officers of the staff. At Anerley the domestic training class for girls has always been worked out in detail and most satisfactorily.[1]

With regard to the needlework done by the girls in the London schools, Miss Poole, the secretary to the M. A. B. Y. S., said in her evidence before the Poor Law Schools Committee that it would quite compete with that done in the London Board Schools, and that in some cases it was perfectly exquisite.[2]

In respect both to boys and girls it is as true now as when Mr. Tufnell wrote that there is a steady demand for *trained* labour, *efficient* labour, and intelligent labour.

"A shopman who wants an errand boy will not take a boy from the streets who is dirty in his habits, unable to read the directions of a parcel, has never heard of the Eighth Commandment, and is unconscious of any moral or religious feeling; but he will readily engage a boy trained in one of these district schools, as he is tolerably sure of getting thence an intelligent, well-behaved lad.

[1] *Poor Law Schools Committee's Report*, pp. 52, 53. [2] Evidence, p. 132.

ding can be better than the trainii of children
blishments. I am aware it is costl , it c t
to become thieves or paupers, or prostitutes, as was the case
erly. When I see those shoeless, half-starved arabs turning somer-
s in the streets I long to send them to a district school, whence I
d warrant to turn them out in two years worth at least 6*s.* or 7*s.* a
. The girls in these schools are all taught to wash, to sew, to
, to clean, in short to do all that is usually required of a
servant; the boys are accustomed to labour, and their intel-
al instruction alone is sufficient to enable them to write good
s, to keep accounts with accuracy, and thus they often become
s, telegraph assistants, and many are turned out as musicians into
rmy and navy, as previously observed."[1]

l the large schools have for years been provided with swimming
, which can be warmed in winter so that the children can be
t swimming throughout the year, to the great benefit of their
h.[2]

Mr. Wyndham Holgate's Report for 1885 it is stated that no fewer
672 boys and 212 girls passed in swimming in 1884.[3] The Poor
Schools Committee recommend that *all* girls should be taught to
,[4] which is somewhat amusing, inasmuch as they recommend also
abolition of large schools, where alone it is possible that such
action can be given to pauper children. As a matter of fact, at
of the large schools both boys and girls are taught to swim.
, Mr. Mozley tells us how at Swinton "the boys swim and dive
great spirit, and they are taught how to rescue a drowning person,
how to revive him when rescued. They did this in my presence.
y mention that an old Swinton boy, who learned swimming at
: schools (which he left about three years ago), rescued last autumn
le boy who had fallen into a deep millpond near Manchester, and
ved the certificate of the Royal Humane Society for so doing.[5]

(3) *Efficient Teaching.*

r *to the third condition*—efficient teaching—the best teachers will
ys seek the largest schools, as in them the emoluments are the
st, and the field for exertion greatest.[6] The teaching in the large

[1] *P. L. B.*, p. 89.
L. G. B., p. 85; 8 *L. G. B.*, p. xliv. (Kirkdale); 9 *L. G. B.*, p. 210 (Swinton).
[3] *L. G. B.*, p. 57. [4] Report, p. 171.
[5] *L. G. B.*, p. 67. See also 18 *L. G. B.*, p. 148 (Portsea Island).
nder the General Orders of the 12th February and the 17th June, 1879, the
masters and schoolmistresses of a workhouse school (*i.e.* of any school other
a district school) appointed after the 28th February, 1879, and the super-
ents, matrons, schoolmasters, and schoolmistresses of district schools appointed

schools has shown continuous improvement since Mr. Tufnell wrote his Report, and follows upon a steady increase in the number of certificated teachers.[1] The salaries have been raised, and consequently teachers of high qualifications, good tone, and recognized status come forward for the vacancies as they occur. "Quite recently," writes Mr. Holgate in 1894, "a lady who passed in honours at Girton College has been appointed as an assistant schoolmistress at one of my largest schools."[2]

But while it is very essential that teachers should be trained in the art of teaching, there are other qualifications necessary for the teachers of Poor Law Schools, which nothing but experience in the working of the system can give.

Mr. Holgate writes as follows on this point:[3]

"I have found in more than one instance that teachers who have had schools under the Committee of Council, and hold high certificates from that department, have not succeeded well when placed in charge of either a district or an ordinary workhouse school. I am impressed with the necessity which exists in our schools for the teachers to identify themselves with the whole life of the children committed to their charge, and I find that those schools are progressing most favourably, and showing the best results as to intellectual ability, morality, general happiness, and intelligence, in which the teachers take part in the amusements and moral supervision of the children out of school, and do not consider their responsibilities at an end (as in the schools of the Committee of Council) when the hour for closing school arrives. In all my best ordered district schools the managers are becoming aware of this, and I am pleased to find that the question is more often put to candidates for a teacher's place, whether they are prepared to take such responsibility as clearly attaching to their office."

Of recent years it has become increasingly the practice in large schools to allow the teachers to reside off the premises. This, of course, has a very good effect on the teaching given, for the teachers maintain their vigour and independence, and are afforded greater facilities for self-improvement and reasonable social intercourse with

after the 24th June, 1879, may be dismissed at any time by the Guardians (in the first case) or by the Boards of Management (in the second case), with the consent of the Local Government Board.

Whether the superintendent and matron are husband and wife or not, the dismissal of one of them renders the office of the other vacant at the expiration of the quarter's notice.

They may not perform their duties by deputy except with the special permission of the Local Government Board on the application of the Guardians or of the Boards of Management (General Orders of the 24th July, 1847, Art. 198, and of the 14th November, 1879, Art. I.).

[1] 9 *L. G. B.*, p. 217; 10 *L. G. B.*, p. 191; 13 *L. G. B.*, p. 189.
[2] 24 *I. G. B.*, p. 73. [3] 5 *L. G. B.*, pp. 171, 172.

the outside world. Besides which, they have a greater freedom than would be possible if they resided within the school precincts. Mr. Holgate, in recommending this course, points out how easily arrangements can be made for it. He says:[1]

"In ordinary district and large separate schools, where the teachers have to be present with the children in the play-hours, and at their meals in one common hall, provision can easily be made for such supervision by weekly turns; whilst in the more recent system of cottage homes their presence is not needed for such duties, which there belong to the foster parents. At the new homes shortly to be opened at Hornchurch for the children of St. Leonard's, Shoreditch, no teacher is to be resident, and consequently the cost of an officers' block has been saved, and the result will, I have no doubt, prove eminently satisfactory, both from the increased brightness and energy of the teaching staff and the absence of divided interests in the homes themselves."

(4) *Education.*

As to the fourth condition—effectual classification and instruction—it is obvious that this condition can be better fulfilled when the number of children is large. Mr. Tufnell instances the action of the London School Board, who had recognized the superiority of large schools on the grounds of economy of time, of money, and of teaching power.

It must be remembered that at the time that large schools were so warmly advocated, national education was in a very backward state, little more than the three R's being taught in the National Schools, and we have seen that in many of the much-abused workhouse schools the education given was better than what could be obtained outside. Mr. Tufnell was perfectly justified in looking forward to a better education for Poor Law children in the large schools than could be obtained in the small ones.[2] The result proved him to be right. But

[1] 18 *L. G. B.*, p. 151.

[2] In 1872 Mr. Mozley remarked that while three-fifths of the children educated in schools containing more than sixty children received what might fairly be called a good education, *i.e.*, an education advanced and varied enough for their capacities, and impressed upon them with such care as to render them able to retain its principles with accuracy, not more than one-fourth of those educated in the smaller schools received an equally good education, and out of this one-fourth nearly three-fourths belonged to schools with between forty and sixty children. He instances the education given in the Kirkdale Schools as what he calls a "good education." The first class in this school, consisting of forty boys, read a passage from *Ivanhoe*, which they had never seen before, with correctness; in one or two instances with spirit and emphasis, in a fair number of cases with a knowledge of the meaning of the more difficult words. Twenty-seven boys in this class were sufficiently advanced to be presented for examination in fractions and decimals, and (taking them altogether) to pass creditably. Fifteen boys did fair and some very creditable papers in geography and history; had it not been for a certain want of practice in paper work, I have little doubt that others would have done well also. The elements of grammar were taught in this class. The age of the boys, with one or two exceptions, varied from eleven to fourteen; the average time during which they had been in the school was not quite four years. Taking the whole school, about 160 boys out of 400 were advanced enough to be presented for examination in rules of arithmetic at least as high as long division of money, and of 310 sums given to these boys 196 were done right. (It should be remarked that perhaps one-third of these sums were in no definite rule, but of a kind to exercise the common-sense of the boys. There is a greater increase of difficulty than might perhaps be supposed in even a very slight variation from the common type of sums to which the boys are accustomed.) Nine classes, containing 270 boys, learnt geography, but only in six classes was the amount taught considerable. Three classes, or about 100 boys, learnt history. The spelling was in no class perfect, but in the upper classes mistakes were made only in words of some real difficulty. See 2 *L. G. B.*, p. 90. Dr. Clutterbuck, however, writing in 1884 upon the schools in the Western District, would not admit the superiority of the large schools over the small ones so far as regarded the three R's. See 14 *L. G. B.*, p. 52.

[1] Report, p. 44.

since he wrote education generally has made great strides, and the Poor Law Schools may, perhaps, not have been able to keep pace with it. Still, no one, and the Poor Law School authorities least of all, was prepared for the sweeping strictures of the late Departmental Committee. They reported as follows:

"Standard of education. The general course of education is that laid down in the regulations of 1847, and except in the matter of drawing has undergone no change or development since. This standard is therefore lower than that attained in public elementary schools; for example, no class or specific subjects or manual training are provided.

"Thus the children already under special disadvantages by birth and environment receive a lower education than that provided for the offspring of persons of the same class but in happier circumstances. Their intelligence is to some extent dwarfed by their secluded and artificial life, and the mechanical routine of their exercises neither arouses interest nor kindles inspiration. To counteract these influences a wider and more varied and generous course of instruction is all the more necessary."[1]

The public were thus given to understand that, except as regards drawing, the kind of education given in Poor Law Schools had remained stationary since 1847, and the criticisms of the Press showed that to be the impression which the public mind had received; whereas, in point of fact, as we have shown in the introductory chapter, the General Order of the 3rd April, 1878, which laid it down that the standards of examination should be those prescribed in the Code of the Education Department in force for the time being, produced a very great change. Children were to be examined individually, and the passes and failures of each child had to be recorded. Over and above

Let us see what the two head-masters of the South Metropolitan and Kensington and Chelsea Schools say on the subject. In a letter to the Editor of the *Poor Law Officers' Journal* they write:[1]

"We, sir, have had some years' experience under the London School Board in schools classed 'excellent,' and unhesitatingly state that the standard of attainments in these schools in the three R's is considerably *higher* than in excellent schools under the Board.

"*No class subjects.* We know Poor Law Schools where geography, grammar, poetry, and singing have been taken on code lines for some years.

"*No manual training.* What about the boy carpenters, shoemakers, tailors, plumbers, and bakers at work in the school shops, so eagerly sought after by the tradesmen who want apprentices? If hand and eye training is meant, in many Poor Law Schools colouring, paper-cutting and folding, and mosaic work are all taught on Rich's method.

"The Report states: 'No systematic plan of object lessons.' Why, sir, this Inspector on the Committee specially complimented a teacher on his blackboard illustrations (consisting of sections of plants, seeds etc., tinted with various coloured chalks) of a lesson in horticulture, *one of a series*, which had been given the day previous to the visit, expressing surprise to find such lessons given in Poor Law Schools.

"In drawing, these schools are examined by the same inspectors as other schools, and compare favourably with them, gaining the 'good' and 'excellent' award, and we find that many are so well up to date that they use a school newspaper or magazine.

"The lads are all taught swimming; cricket and football matches are arranged with other schools; they have a good library, the books being changed weekly.

"During the winter months the class rooms are used two evenings a week as reading rooms, all the best magazines and illustrated papers being supplied, while those who prefer it may spend their time playing chess, draughts, halma, or other similar parlour games.

"Interesting lectures, illustrated by the lantern, are given, while the staff provide plays, musical entertainments, and occasionally form themselves into a minstrel troupe for the amusement of the children.

"What more can be done? These, sir, are the facts, and yet we have it on the authority of the Departmental Committee that nothing is taught in these schools except reading, writing, and arithmetic."[2]

One of the school managers of the West London District Schools has kindly supplied us with a list of the subjects beyond the three R's taught in the schools.

[1] May 15th, 1896.

[2] In an able criticism of the Departmental Committee's Report (Knight & Co.), Mr. H. D. Aslett tells us that the writers of the above letter had only taken up Poor Law work quite recently, having been teachers under the London School Board. "So that their sympathies would naturally be with Board Schools; but they honourably stand up for the Poor Law Schools, speaking of them as they find them, and their dual experience gives the greatest weight to their opinion."

Boys' Department. Drawing, scripture, geography, picture and object lessons in Primer Class and Standards I., II. and III., recitation, singing (tonic sol-fa) from note, grammar (a little), composition in all the standards excepting the primers, letter-writing from Standards III. upwards.

Girls' Department. Singing (tonic sol-fa), object lessons, needlework (1st and 2nd Standards do it in the class-rooms, higher Standards in the needle-room), grammar, geography, scripture, recitation, composition, ambulance, physical drill (pole and dumb-bell), paper weaving and cane weaving. Cooking is now being taught by a trained teacher.

Boys' and Girls' Departments. At the Leavesden Schools the three R's are taught according to the education code of 1896. In addition are taken object lessons, English and recitation, geography, singing at sight in all the Standards, and drawing (freehand, model, geometry, and to scale). By means of daily and weekly papers the children are kept informed of passing events. The infants take kindergarten. The standards of the London schools are, we are given to understand, stricter than those in the Board Schools.

The following extract from the letter of a school manager of one of the district schools, throws more light on the true facts of the case than can be obtained from the Departmental Committee's Report. In that school "the schoolmistress goes through a very good geography reader with the girls one day in the week, and varies this with social and domestic economy. When you look at the well-grown children who are working at the very rudiments, on account of previous neglect, and when you remember that for the children's own good they are put to industrial work as soon as they have passed Standard III. or eleven years of age, so that they shall not go out without the use of their hands, and when you consider the proportion of 'ins and outs,' you see that there are not many who can go far in school learning. If you were to talk to one of the school teachers and then visit a Board School in the special districts that feed the Poor Law Schools, I think you would find that children in extreme poverty do not anywhere learn many accomplishments. We may call these children by any name we like, and we may break off the entail of their parents' vices; but we cannot put them on an equality as to learning and as to manual training with children of intelligent respectable artisans."

With such difficulties to contend with it would be no matter for surprise if the children of "the Poor Law Schools of the Metropolis are far below the standard usually attained, age for age, by the children in public elementary schools."[1] But this statement is really an indict-

[1] Report of Departmental Committee, p. 39.

ment against the educational authority of the district from which the children come. "On the admission of children," writes a head schoolmaster of one of the district schools, "we find, in the majority of the cases, that they have attended school irregularly, and that in some instances they had been withdrawn from instruction entirely." These children (to use the words of the Report) *are* "far below the standard usually attained, age for age, by children in public elementary schools." It is a misfortune undoubtedly that such neglected and ignorant children should be found at this time, but it is certainly the gravest injustice to send backward, neglected, and at the same time delicate children to a Poor Law School and straightway charge the school with inefficiency, holding such children up as the results of the work rather than crediting the school for attaining such satisfactory results with such inferior material. Children in those schools advance a Standard each year. What more is done in any other class of school?

The attendance is undoubtedly regular, but the stay at school is short (less than six months on an average). In estimating results it should be borne in mind that before the recent Order all who had attained the age of eleven and had passed Standard III. were half-timers.

Mr. Wainwright, the Chairman of the Board of Management of the North Surrey District Schools, says:

"The school instruction described in the Report is a caricature of what exists at Anerley, where the teachers are trained and certificated, and the education on a level with that of Board Schools, the boys not being allowed to work as half-timers till they have passed Standard IV., and are twelve years of age. The industrial training is complete and thorough; every boy is taught a trade, and no boy is ever sent to service except when he can follow that trade; and we have built up so good a reputation among employers by really skilled teaching, that we have never any difficulty in obtaining suitable situations. As to the girls, it is admitted in the Report that our systematic training of young servants in domestic work has always been worked out most satisfactorily, and it is a significant fact that we have twice as many applications for girls as we are able to supply."[1]

What was being done in the London schools in 1890 can be learnt from the very full particulars given by Mr. Holgate in his Report for that year.[2] At Sutton, evening lectures on elementary science and general subjects of interest were being given by the assistant-masters, to the boys who liked to attend; the nucleus of a museum had been formed, and the library in the senior school contained 520 volumes, and in the junior school 409, the use of the books being much valued by the boys.[3] In the girls' school, too, a similar museum

[1] Letter to the *Times*, 1896. [2] 20 *L. G. B.*, pp. 280, 297. [3] *Ibid.*, p. 282.

had been started. At Forest Gate a certain number of boys (from eight to twelve in number) were allowed to attend the classes for technical instruction in carpentering, plumbing, smith's work, and drawing at the Carpenters' Institute, Stratford, the experiment having met with marked success "by the creation of a spirit of emulation and a desire to excel, which it is difficult to arouse when a lad has to gain a knowledge of a trade with the limited means at the command of an industrial trainer in the school."[1] At Banstead and Enfield museums had been started of objects useful for instruction.[2] At Edmonton industrial classes of girls had been formed for occasional evening instruction, and had met with satisfactory results.[3]

Mr. Wyndham Holgate noted in 1894 a distinct advance in the endeavour to improve the intelligence of the children by a well-considered system of object lessons;[4] and we have shown by examples of the educational work carried out at the present time, how inaccurate are the statements made in the Report of the Departmental Committee.

The giving of prizes, which is now carried out in most of the large schools, has also a great effect in developing the intelligence of the children. Mr. Holgate remarked on this point as follows in his Report for 1879:[5]

"In my opinion it is necessary that general good conduct should be required in combination with proficiency in any subject, and that at least a fair standing in the school should accompany excellence in any purely industrial pursuit. In carrying out this system of prize-giving, the assistance of the wives and daughters of Guardians or Managers in judging of the proficiency of the girls in their branches of industry would be of the greatest possible benefit, and would go far to meet the objections which from time to time appear in the public press against the system which at present obtains, by permitting women to do women's work in thus kindly and unofficially inspecting and reporting on the purely domestic departments of these schools."

It may be well to state that the expense of these prizes can be, and sometimes is, paid out of the rates.

We may add that many of the pupil teachers in the schools have themselves received their education there. They are promoted from the ranks for good conduct and ability, and most of them do well. Some of them pass into college and become Board School teachers.[6] If the education given in the schools was as defective as the Depart-

[1] 20 *L. G. B.*, p. 285. [2] *Ibid.*, pp. 286, 295. [3] *Ibid.*, p. 293.
[4] 24 *L. G. B.*, p. 70. [5] 9 *L. G. B.*, p. 217.
[6] Evidence before Committee, p. 274.

mental Committee's Report described it to be, such a thing would be impossible.

Time alone will show what will be the effect of the recent Order on "Instruction of Children" on the industrial training which is now given in the schools; but there cannot be the least doubt that the freedom of School Managers and School Committees will be much fettered in dealing with the children according to their individualities, unless they are kept much longer in the schools than at present, or sent to training homes. It is not difficult to see that the whole tendency of the Order is to break up the schools and to get the children sent to the public elementary schools, and to sacrifice industrial training, and the getting the children out into the world as early as possible, to more education of a purely scholastic character.

(5) *The Economical Argument.*

As to the fifth condition—the economical argument. Mr. Tufnell thought it would be allowed that it was proportionally cheaper to feed and clothe 20 people than 10, 100 people than 50, and so on. In proportion to the increase of numbers, less attendance and less coals would be required, and the contracts being larger would be obtained at a lower price. (But see *infra*, p. 121.)

(6) *Permanence of Teachers.*

As to the sixth condition—permanence of teachers. It is found that in large schools the head teachers rarely change, the reason being that in large establishments the salaries are justifiably larger, the arrangements more comfortable, and the field for exertion—always an object to a conscientious teacher—greater and far more interesting than in small ones. In these latter the teachers are always changing, and Mr. Tufnell had rarely known a teacher remain more than three years in them.

(7) *Future of Children Assured.*

As to the seventh condition—the placing the child in a position to earn an independent livelihood—district schools are not usually placed in the parish or even in the Union whence the children are drawn. Hence, if they are placed out, as must often be the case, in situations near the school, they are sent away from their native haunts and low relations. Further, the trades that have been found most effectual in depauperising—music and seamanship—which are peculiar to district schools, cannot be thoroughly taught in any other than large schools.

There are also other occupations taught, which often prove of the greatest advantage in after life, such as engineering, drawing, carpentry, cooking, sewing by machinery, swimming, which are difficult to teach effectually and systematically in small schools.

We have already shown in this chapter[1] what, under good management, the large schools are capable of doing in the matter of industrial training, and so of enabling the children to get good situations and employment by which the success of their future careers is assured.[2]

There is no better method of placing children in the way of earning an independent livelihood than the early inculcation of thrift. In Mr. Holgate's important Report of 1890 on the Metropolitan schools, he tells us how interested the managers of the schools are in encouraging it, sometimes giving prizes with that object.[3]

[1] *Ante*, p. 86.

[2] Mr. Wodehouse sets out the advantages of the large schools over the small schools very clearly in his Report for 1867 (20 *P. L. B.*, p. 156). See also 23 *P. L. B.*, p. 12; 5 *L. G. B.*, p. 137.

[3] See 20 *L. G. B.*, pp. 282, 286 and 294.

CHAPTER IV.

DISTRICT AND SEPARATE SCHOOLS

(Continued).

WHILE a system which satisfies the conditions laid down in the last chapter cannot be condemned as absolutely bad, as has been recently done by the Departmental Committee on Metropolitan Poor Law Schools, it has like every other system its special defects, which are well known to those who have to administer it. These defects must always be present in a greater or less degree. But they can be minimised by good administration. We may enumerate them as arising from—

1. The loss of the family tie.
2. The monotonous and confined life of the children.
3. The system being too good.
4. The massing of children together preventing their physical, moral, and mental development.
5. The costliness of the system.
6. The liability to outbreaks of infectious disease among the children.

(1) *The Loss of the Family Tie.*

It is alleged that it is almost impossible to establish family or domestic ties of any kind. We fully admit that no system of public education, even where the intellectual and industrial training is of the very best, can supply the place of that parental care, and those home influences of which the orphan and deserted children are necessarily deprived; but on the other hand it must be pointed out that in the classes to which these children belong, the advantage of the "family tie" is very doubtful. Indeed, there is a great deal of truth in Mr. Tufnell's remark that, when pauper children have parents, those parents are often the children's greatest enemies, and the less they see of them the better.[1] It must be remembered, also, that even where the

[1] 23 *P. L. B.*, p. 207.

family tie is absent, affection is not, pupils often becoming much attached to their masters and mistresses, and to each other. Indeed, this alleged disadvantage is apt to be much exaggerated.

(2) *The Monotonous and Confined Life.*

The monotonous and confined life of the children who, when orphan or deserted, live in the schools continuously, must to a great extent prevent the development of many of those faculties of mind and body which, in the case of children who must look forward to a hard industrial life, it is most important to expand.[1] Anything, therefore, which will relieve this monotony and bring them into closer connection with the outside world is to be welcomed. The efforts of Guardians and School Managers have been directed to this end, and with a considerable amount of success. Mrs. Nassau Senior, in her well-known Report of 1874, observed that "with some striking exceptions, the girls at the schools showed a curious dulness as to play, which was significant of undeveloped natures. On making this remark to some of the officers, I found it was a matter of common observation. I have seldom seen energetic play going on, either in the playgrounds or day-rooms. Though there is a marked superiority on this point in some schools over others, I have rarely found, when I asked girls to show me a game, that they could set themselves spontaneously to anything of the sort: all seemed to depend on the promptings of the yard mistress. There appears to be no tradition of games in the schools. To teach them to play with intelligence and enjoyment would be well worth the trouble as an educational process. Playing with energy would be a step towards working with energy."[2]

A Memorandum issued by the Local Government Board in March, 1880, recommends for all Poor Law Schools (1) covered play-sheds sufficient to contain all the children in wet or inclement weather; (2) a piece of turf or meadow-land for outdoor exercise; and (3) in the yards and in the play-sheds, or in rooms specially devoted to such purposes, the means of physical training, such as swings, parallel bars, ropes and rings, and other simple gymnastic apparatus.

Further, in a circular issued in January, 1891, the Board enlarge on the desirability of a good supply of illustrated books and periodicals, and of bats, balls, and skipping-ropes and toys.

It is satisfactory to learn from the Report of the Departmental Committee on Poor Law Schools (p. 167) that there are now playing fields attached to nearly all the Metropolitan schools.

[1] 23 *P. L. B.*, pp. 12, 13. [2] 3 *L. G. B.*, p. 326.

bands of Hope galas, etc., in the neighbourhood. Every child in the school able to go was taken, the whole number being a little short of 800. The day was fair, the sail was a pretty long one (over two hours each way), and the children will not readily forget such a delightful treat."

(3) *The System is too Good.*

It is further objected that the schools are on a scale which reverse all the probable conditions of a child's after life. This defect especially affects the girls, who go from comparative palaces to houses "where 'elbow grease' takes the place of furniture polish; bath bricks of Kent's machines; a small kitchen of the spacious dining hall; an open stove of the patent kitchener; a tub of soap-suds of the steam-worked washing apparatus, etc."[1]

This was written in 1874, and refers to a defect which it is difficult to avoid where children are massed together in large numbers, and the Departmental Committee on Metropolitan Poor Law Schools allege it still to exist. They say, "The laundry operations are, in the majority of these schools, conducted on a large scale. In one of the district schools no less than 35,000 articles are washed each week. The magnitude of the operations necessitates the use of steam and the employment of a number of laundry-women, whilst the girls, instead of being taught the arts of washing, starching, and ironing, become mere drudges to fill drying racks and turn the handles of washing machines."[2] The recommendation of the Committee that the laundries should be broken up and the work done in small wash-houses and ironing rooms so as to accustom the girls to the usual appliances of domestic life, is one with which no one can disagree. As we have shown, it has been established in many of the schools. But some machinery must be used. Mr. Birkby answers the question, "How can a girl acquire any knowledge of housework when she never sees an open fire, when the rooms are warmed by hot-water pipes, the cooking done by gas, and the washing by steam?" by replying that the question implies that which does not exist at Swinton.[3] He says:

"The building generally, and for very good reasons, is heated by hot-air pipes, but there are resident officers who occupy sitting rooms that have open fires. These fires are made by the girls, under the direction and supervision of an efficient housemaid and other officers. The cooking, if done by gas, will only be in part, and is it not a probability, in the future, that in homes where servants will be required this improved method will certainly be adopted? The whole of the washing is done by steam. To do the washing by hand is unknown even now in a marked degree in modern houses. In the school laundry steam has to be used for the quantities of children's clothing required weekly. The washing of the officers' clothing is done by hand, and herein comes the opportunity for teaching. The elder girls are taught ironing."

[1] 4 *L. G. B.*, p. 223. See also 14 *L. G. B.*, p. 54. [2] Report, p. 53.

[3] Swinton is a Poor Law "barrack" school near Manchester where some 700 children are educated and trained.

Mr. Birkby then quotes a letter he had received in 1894 from the Hon. Secretary of the Manchester School of Domestic Economy and Cookery, which a number of girls from the Swinton Schools were allowed by the Guardians to attend.

"DEAR SIR,—We were all exceedingly pleased with your girls from Swinton, when they came for the cooking lessons. These were so nice in every way that we have repeated the offer of free lessons this session. The girls were well-mannered, intelligent, and respectful, without any of the servility so much to be deplored in public institutions like yours. They had been well taught kitchen work before they came to us, and reflect much credit on Mrs. Birkby and you."

He ends up this portion of his interesting paper by saying that the children are taught, and have as part of their duty to learn, "how to lay fires, and the mysteries of saucepans and stew-pots, wash-tubs, and hand-dollies."[1]

There is also, no doubt, some reason for complaint that the children are overfed. The paternal care of the Local Government Board has carefully prepared suitable dietaries for the children, and the quantities allowed are ample. In the opinion of some people they are too much.

"The usual custom is for the carver to weigh out to each child the quantity to which by its registered age it is entitled, quite regardless of its appetite or condition of health. The result is that one child gets more than it either could or should eat, while another, needing more than the regulation quantity, does not have enough. All who have to do with children know that some will overeat themselves if provisions are placed before them, while a delicate child will leave most of its food untouched unless it is to its taste, or if excessive in quantity. The present dietary system, in fact, tends to overfeeding on the one hand and to malnutrition on the other."[2]

No one would be inclined to deny the truth of this criticism, and the efforts of school managers and school committees have been directed to getting the Central Authority to allow them more freedom in the matter. There need be no waste, and in these days there is

[1] Paper read before the North-Western Poor Law Officers' Association at Manchester in 1896. [2] Report of Departmental Committee, p. 163.

least satisfied with was the younger boys in the large schools, who appeared to him to be in many cases of defective vitality, and did not seem as if they took exercise enough, and they suffered too much in some cases from chilblains, superficial whitlow, and diseases of that class.[1] But this evidence seems to tell rather in favour of the schools than otherwise, because one would naturally expect the younger children not to have had time to throw off the evil effects of their life and surroundings previously to entering the schools.

We have already pointed to the way in which physical development is encouraged at the present time by means of gymnastics, drill, cricket, football, and outdoor exercise of other kinds. The *Exmouth* boys might be supposed to be physically stronger than the boys of a "barrack" school, and yet they often get beaten in their games with the others. A greater variety in the dietaries of the schools might possibly be an advantage;[2] but, when all has been done that can be done, it is impossible to deny that the want of liberty and variety in large institutions where the children are kept without any change of scene for several years is not the best atmosphere for encouraging physical development.

(*b*) As to the Moral Development of the Children.

Large schools do not appear to have any deteriorating influence on boys in this respect, but as regards girls the evidence on this point is conflicting. The Poor Law Schools Committee have never shown their bias against large schools more than in the paragraphs of their Report which deal with the question.[3] Miss Whitworth and Miss Townsend, the honorary secretaries of two branches of the M. A. B. Y. S., and Dr. Barnardo are the only witnesses whose evidence was considered as worthy the attention of the Committee. Thus they find the following to be the list of the faults which specially characterise girls brought up in large schools: "Rudeness, sullenness, violence, destructiveness, carelessness, idleness, obstinacy, and a curious ignorance of common things." The sullenness and obstinacy are specially described as "intense." Further, they "do not for a time respond to kindness"; "have very little affection"; "are generally helpless without personal supervision, and leave their places for bad temper, dirty habits in their work and person, laziness, dishonesty." The statement of Dr. Barnardo, who regards "barrack schools as an unmixed evil," that "very few will come from Poor Law institutions who have not been apparently more

[1] Evidence before Poor Law Schools Committee, p. 383.
[2] See Poor Law Schools Committee's Report, p. 163.
[3] Report, pp. 12, 13.

or less contaminated," is accepted as unquestionable. There is nothing in what the Committee report on the question which would not lead the ordinary reader to suppose that the girls who were sent out from Poor Law Schools were very devils.[1] That anyone not carried away by prejudice or preconceived ideas, or who has had to do with the girls referred to, would endorse such accusations, is inconceivable. The evidence to the contrary is positively startling. The Committee preferred Miss Whitworth's and Miss Townsend's evidence to that of the secretary of the M. A. B. Y. S. We, on the contrary, prefer Miss Poole's, and, although the Committee took no notice of results, we have done so.[2] If, indeed, the girls were such little devils as they are described to be, how is it that so few of them do badly in after life, considering the class from which they are drawn? Nor does the Committee take any note of the success of the M. A. B. Y. S. in its noble work. Thus, in her first return Mrs. Nassau Senior could only classify out of 490 girls from the Poor Law Schools who were in service during 1871 and 1872 forty-six per cent. as "good or fair." In 1895, some twenty years later, the M. A. B. Y. S. could classify as such ninety-one per cent. in a total number of 3654 girls.[3] The method of classification, too, has not been altered.[4] Mrs. Nassau Senior included under "fair" such cases as the following:

1. "Honest, truthful, but sullen; very good needlewoman, but did not know much of housework. The girl was very unsatisfactory in her last place, but has improved.
2. "Much improved. At first was untruthful and pilfered; could do laundry work and common scrubbing when she came, but hardly any housework; no cooking; could not pare a potato.
3. "Very bad temper; not truthful, but hard-working; willing and tolerably clean. Her mistress does not at all despair of her as she is improving."

Then, as to the standard of comparison, Miss Poole considers that the public hardly judge the girls fairly. "The girls should be compared with the same class who have not passed through the Poor Law Schools, not with ideal young servants."[5] Judged by this standard, Miss Poole's evidence goes to show how the mistresses who take this class of girl prefer those from the Poor Law Schools to local girls. In Lambeth

[1] It will perhaps be observed that the girls have escaped the charge of immorality. The schools should therefore at least be credited with turning out moral girls.
[2] See *ante*, p. 91, and *post*, p. 361.
[3] See a letter from "A Subscriber" in the *Guardian* newspaper, November 4, 1896.
[4] Miss Poole, indeed, says the standard has been raised. "We never lower it, we intend to raise it." (Evidence, p. 196.)
[5] Evidence, p. 147.

the agent of the M. A. B. Y. S. says that "the school girls keep their places best, and the mistresses decidedly prefer school girls." The special virtue of the school girls is that they are more truthful and cleaner and neater than locals, and pay their debts for clothes and lodging far better, and their failings are that they are apt to be dull and mechanical when first placed out. In the Holborn branch the agent has worked for ten and a half years, and has had 200 girls under her care. She thinks the local girls keep their places best, and the mistresses prefer local girls. She thinks the special virtue of school girls is gratitude, and that their failing is temper. In the Islington branch the agent has worked ten years, and had 1200 school girls under her care. She thinks the school girls keep their places best, and that the mistresses decidedly prefer school girls. The special virtues of the school girls are that they are more industrious and honest than local girls, and cleaner and neater, and their failings are temper and untruthfulness. In the Chelsea branch the agent has worked nineteen years; she has had 300 school girls under her care. She thinks there is no difference between school girls and local girls as to the way they keep their places, and the mistresses have no preference as to which girls they engage. She thinks the school girls attend service on Sunday better, and are more steady and obedient. Their principal failing is temper, but many are very nice girls.[1]

It would occupy too much space to give Miss Poole's evidence on the point in full;[2] but anyone who wants to arrive at the whole truth of the matter must not rely on the Report alone, which absolutely ignores all Miss Poole's evidence on this head. But did we choose to pick out many of the epithets applied by the agents of the M. A. B. Y. S. to Poor Law Schools girls, we might describe them as "truthful, clean and neat, grateful, industrious, honest, steady, obedient, docile, affectionate, well-behaved, teachable, proud of their schools and anxious to do them credit, self-controlled, chaste, willing and anxious to do well." The one great defect they seem to suffer from is temper, and if it were not for this defect their combination of the qualities of the devil and the angel would make them "nice" girls, as, indeed, we believe them to be. And even as regards temper and the charge of untruthfulness made against them, we find that "local" girls, as might naturally be expected, have the same failings.[3]

Another witness[4] says, "I have been a worker among the poor since

[1] Miss Poole's Evidence, p. 149.
[2] We have given a summary of it at p. 361, *post*.
[3] See Miss Poole's Evidence, p. 150.
[4] See Miss Thompson's Evidence, pp. 275-276.

I was eighteen years of age, and I certainly think that the results in after life of the girls in the pauper schools compare wonderfully with those who have been brought up in their own homes. I know there are difficulties. The greatest complaint I hear is that the children have bad tempers. I think that is quite accounted for. It is what we should naturally expect; it is simply the development of the germs from their wretched parentage. I think it is only another form of the low, common, rowdy girl that we see about in our back courts; that is another form; it develops in that way when they have not been in school; it develops in another way when they come to these small places, and I think the difficulty is that they have not been tried in the schools as they are in after life. When they first go out to service they only get the small places; the mistresses are not all that we should desire. They expect a finished servant instead of a child, and the child is not prepared to meet the little difficulties." This witness also thought that these tendencies were inherited in the children, for the schools took the very lowest class of child—that is to say, children who could not get admittance into orphanages and other voluntary institutions, all of which require a certificate of health, and so took the very cream of the children. In consequence, therefore, of the difference of material the comparison of Poor Law children with those of other schools was not fair.

We have referred later on (see p. 130) to the Warren Farm Schools[1] at Brighton as an instance of the depauperising effect of the education and training of a large school. The following remarks appeared in a Brighton newspaper in reference to a highly successful and gratifying Christmas meeting in 1882 in which some sixty boys, varying in age from fourteen to twenty-four years, who had been educated at the schools, and who were then earning their own living, took part, and Mr. Holgate quotes them in his 1882 Report.[2]

"There are, or have been, those who have questioned the wisdom of providing, and doubted the efficient administration of such institutions as the Warren Farm Schools of this town. All doubts and questionings would have been removed could those who had them have been present at this gathering. The bright intelligence and contentment seen in the faces, the proof of good hard work manifest in most of the hands, the evident marks of well-being and well-doing borne by nearly all, together with the tokens of self-respect as well as regard for others, which were abundantly manifest, gave clear testimony to the good results which the system, when properly worked, may be made to produce. We say 'when properly worked' because we feel that,

[1] The average number of children in these schools ("barracks") is 270.
[2] 12 *L. G. B.*, p. 106.

for such a result to be arrived at, it is necessary that those who are responsible for the management should be men who know what they have to do, and have the qualifications needful for the doing of it. Such men, when found, are worthy of all consideration; and, looked at in every light, we think the gathering to which we refer is one on which we may congratulate our fellow-townsmen, and express the hope that it may some day be repeated on a larger scale."

It is scarcely necessary to say that the Warren Farm Schools still continue to be well managed, and consequently to produce good results. Thus Mr. Davy in his latest Report[1] says:

"At schools like Brighton, where the superintendent is not only capable, but constantly anxious to do the best he can for the children, and where the Guardians spare no trouble, there are many more applications from mistresses for girls than can be supplied, and the school committee are in this way able to make a strict selection of the most promising places. About half the boys join the army and navy bands, and of these a certain proportion go to Kneller Hall to be trained as bandmasters. The only possible explanation of these facts is that the children receive a careful industrial training, which puts them into a position superior to that of the children of independent labourers, so far as earning their own living is concerned. If regard is had to the fact that the pauper children are mostly badly bred, badly treated in infancy, and often severely handicapped by the misconduct of their relations, this result goes far to prove that whatever improvements may be possible in details, no sudden and violent change in existing methods is necessary."

Miss Mason, although a great advocate for boarding-out under the proper supervision of committees, has also a good word for Poor Law Schools.

"As showing that in some at least of the Poor Law Schools children are happy and kindly treated, I may mention that two Lambeth girls, who had been boarded-out for more than two years in an excellent home, were, with their foster-parents' concurrence, saving up their pennies in order to re-visit the Norwood Schools, where, they told me, they had been so happy. They wished especially to see the matron, to whom they were much attached."[2]

That girls, much more than boys, require watching and befriending during their early years of service after leaving Poor Law Schools may be admitted, but nowadays there are so many societies and ladies who take an interest in them that the failures are comparatively few. We agree with Mr. Birkby that "given fair play, and treated as human beings, our" (Poor Law School) "girls will, and do, make excellent servants," whether they be educated and trained at Swinton, or in any

[1] 25 *L. G. B.*, p. 174. [2] 20 *L. G. B.*, p. 307.

other large Poor Law School. Considering the class to which the large majority of them belong, however their physical development may be affected, their moral qualities rather improve than deteriorate in a "barrack" school, if it be well managed.

(1) As to the Mental Development of the Children.

Under this head the Departmental Committee say: "We have received abundant evidence to show that children, when housed together in large numbers, suffer from mental dulness, and are not as apt and intelligent as other children." "When it is remembered that the wisest system of education has for its object the development of individual tastes, capacities, and interests, it becomes evident that the instruction of the scholars in these large establishments is carried on under unfavourable conditions." This "abundant evidence" is that of Miss McKee, Dr. Warner, Miss Brodie Hall, and Dr. Littlejohn. Miss McKee has for some years been one of the managers of the Marylebone Union School at Southall. The Committee, referring to only seven of her 350 answers,[1] quote her as a lady who, having had opportunities of comparing Poor Law children with others, "thinks that the Poor Law children are of poorer stamina than others, and although they have the advantage of better sanitary conditions at the schools, and a better dietary, the fact that at the schools the children have everything done for them, and that there is less activity in their life, accounts for the absence of mental alertness. They are apt to become dull and wooden, and the girls are very slow in everything they do." Here the Report stops, and neglects to mention the fact that Miss McKee qualified this last statement, partly accounting for this dulness[2] "that they (the girls) know that they have never done work, and that directly they have done one task another is set for them," but that the Schools Committee had "made an alteration in the last six months" (*i.e.*, since July, 1894), "and the girls have an hour or two in the evening for themselves, so that the sooner they have done their work the more time they will have to themselves." Nor does the Report tell us that Miss McKee also said "the number of teachers and managers is sufficient to enable them to give some individual attention to the children; they are able to look after them, and to study their different characters and treat them accordingly, instead of treating them *en masse*."[3] Nor does the Report state that Miss

[1] Evidence, 7962–7968.
[2] *Ibid.*, p. 287. Question 7968.
[3] *Ibid.* Question 7779.

McKee is in favour of the very kind of school that Southall is,[1] where these "dull" children are alleged to be produced,[2] actually preferring them to cottage homes of twenty to twenty-five children. Nor does it mention that in spite of this "dulness" Miss McKee states that in the Reports from the M. A. B. Y. S. on the Southall girls, the schools were second best of all the schools, that fairly good places were found for them, and that some of them have stayed two or three years in their places; that when they are servants they go on writing to the matron, and come and pay her a visit in the holidays; that there is an affectionate relation between the girls and the schools; that there is a treat in the summer at the schools, to which they are invited, and to which all those who can be spared come;[3] that when they leave school nearly all of them, except those that are defective in mind, can write a nice letter, nicely written and fairly spelled.[4] Such little incidents as these are not important enough for the Departmental Committee to mention. Then we come to Dr. Littlejohn. On his answers to two questions[5] out of 239 is founded the following statement in the Report: "The tendency of large schools is to make the children 'rather morose, sullen, and obstinate.' They cannot be individualised, but are apt to run in one groove, and those who enter the school with marked characteristics lose them little by little, and tend to become like the other children."[6] It is not mentioned that Dr. Littlejohn does not think it produces dulness so much, and with regard to the girls being rather morose, sullen, and obstinate, we will give the whole question and answer.

"490. (Mr. Mundella.) 'You said the tendency was to make them grow in one groove, mechanical?'—'I did not use the word "mechanical," I said the tendency was to run them all into one mould; as to the influence on their characters, among the girls *up to within recent years*, there was a most marked tendency to make them sullen—rather morose, sullen, and obstinate. But *at that time* I should say the girls were not treated in the same way that they are being treated now. *In recent years the alteration in discipline and treatment has been such that the girls are very much better than they used to be as far as temper goes.*"[7]

After such a striking instance of the bias of the Report, we do not think we shall be required to go into Miss Brodie Hall's and Dr. Warner's statement on the subject, or into any more of the abundant

[1] The Southall schools have on an average from 315 to 340 children, although they could accommodate 390. (Evidence, p. 282.)
[2] Evidence. Question 7791. But Miss McKee would like the children sent to the Board Schools outside.
[3] *Ibid.* Questions 7956–7960.
[4] *Ibid.* Question 7976.
[5] *Ibid.* Questions 430, 490.
[6] Report, p. 12.
[7] The italics are our own.

evidence, etc., which is contained in the answers to twelve questions only out of 17,566! It is quite clear that this alleged "dulness" need not necessarily be inherent in large schools, if the girls are not kept in them too long. Then Miss Lidgett tells us that before they introduced more life into the Leavesden Schools she observed a good deal of dulness and discontentedness in the children, and that when she visited the Roman Catholic School at Totteridge, where they kept a good many of the girls till they were sixteen, she noticed the same expression of countenance which the girls used to wear at Leavesden when she first visited the schools fifteen years ago.[1] She did not consider that the amount of work that the girls in the schools had to do either depressed them physically or made them dull or nervously timid. On the contrary they always seemed happy while there.[2] That there must be a certain loss of individualisation in large schools is indeed apparent; that the physical, moral, and mental development of the children are rendered the more difficult the larger the school is, we would not deny for a moment. Aggregation of children in great numbers in large barrack-like buildings cannot be good for them. All we have tried to show is that Guardians and school managers, working with voluntary associations for the after care of the children, have tried to minimise undoubted evils, and that success has attended their efforts. It is a pity that these efforts should have met with so little acknowledgment from a Committee which, according to Mr. Brooke Lambert and Mr. Vallance, drew the greater part of its recommendations from conditions already existing in Poor Law Schools.[3]

(5) *The System is a Costly One.*

The earlier supporters of district schools urged in their favour that they would be economical, principally on the ground that it would be less expensive to educate and train a large number of children in one institution than small numbers in many institutions. But when they wrote thus the practice of sending children from country workhouses to public elementary schools was not much in vogue, nor indeed recommended on account of the backward state of national education at the time, while boarding-out was hardly known. The battle then was between workhouse (or small) schools and district or separate (large) schools. There could not be the least doubt that the latter system was the least expensive, if the education and training which could be given in the large schools were taken into consideration. And Mr. Tufnell's arguments were at the time,[4] indeed, perfectly sound. Almost all the

[1] Evidence, p. 53. [2] *Ibid.*, pp. 57–58. [3] Report, p. 174. [4] *Ante*, p. 84.

expert opinion was on his side,[1] and the defects which Mrs. Nassau Senior and Dr. Nettleship pointed out in 1874 were not foreseen. While there cannot be the least doubt that the education and industrial training given to pauper children, and especially to boys in large schools, was for many years a great deal better than they would receive under other conditions, and that it has had a depauperising effect, it is questionable whether, now that national education has so much improved, these large schools are necessary. An idea of the cost of the different systems is given in the Report of the Departmental Committee on Metropolitan Schools as follows:[2]

	Average Cost a year per Child. £	s.	d.
Metropolitan Schools	29	5	6
Sheffield Scattered Homes	15	12	0*
Certified Homes (normal children) . . .	15	12	0
" " (special cases) . . .	18	4	0
Boarding-out	13	6	8

* The cost is really considerably greater. See *post*, p. 165.

But the question of cost is not the determining factor as to what system is best, and although "barrack" schools are condemned, the still more expensive system of "cottage homes" is supported by very strong arguments, and is probably the system best suited for large centres of population. Boarding-out is undoubtedly a cheap way of dealing with pauper children, and a good one when properly supervised, but it can only deal with certain classes of children, and the rest must be provided for by means of institutions of some kind.

(6) *The System Favours Outbreaks of Infectious Diseases.*

Mrs. Nassau Senior, while admitting that the low death-rate at the Metropolitan pauper schools, as compared with the death-rate among the street children of large towns,[3] told well for the care bestowed on the children in the schools, said that the fact remained that these children were subject to constant ophthalmia and skin diseases. These, as well as other infectious diseases, are, of course,

[1] See 22 *P. L. B.*, pp. 123-124, where Mr. Bowyer comes to the same conclusion as Mr. Tufnell. Workhouse schools were undoubtedly kept alive and the Guardians led to resist the pressure put upon them to establish district schools by the Parliamentary grant made for the payment of the salaries of teachers. Mr. Wodehouse and others, who also advocated district schools, hoped that this grant would be withdrawn, and the money spent on the building of those schools. See 21 *P. L. B.*, p. 104.

[2] Report, p. 159.

[3] For the evidence of this see 22 *P. L. B.*, pp. 116, 117; 2 *L. G. B.*, p. 86; 3 *L. G. B.*, p. 225 (note); 19 *L. G. B.*, p. 164.

encouraged where all kinds of children are massed together in one large building, for when by accident or neglect an unhealthy child is introduced into such a school it may be the means of its infecting the other children. This danger was early recognized by the Central Authority, and the attention of Metropolitan Boards of Guardians and school managers was directed to it in two circular letters of the 3rd December, 1873.[1] It is quite certain that if the precautions mentioned in these letters are taken there will be very little risk in having a considerable number of children in one building. In regard to ophthalmia, the example of the Anerley Schools shows that it is not necessarily inherent in large schools. Mr. Tufnell refers to the outbreak of this disease in 1872, which was caused entirely by defective industrial and sanitary arrangements.[2] These defects were remedied,[3] with the consequence that in only one year since then (1885) has there been any further outbreak of the disease.[4] The outbreak of 1885 was "owing to the reception of an infant into the probationary wards, who, on its arrival, was not observed to have diseased eyes, but who, in less than a week, communicated the disease to forty other children." Since then no child is allowed to be admitted into the schools which shows any sign of a tendency to eye mischief. Such children are returned to the infirmaries of the Union to which they are chargeable. This plan, joined to most careful administration, has been successful in entirely protecting the schools from ophthalmia since that time.[5] The Swinton Schools, near Manchester, afford another example of how preventible these outbreaks of ophthalmia are. Mr. Birkby, the superintendent, describing the health of the children generally, says: "It is an

[1] 3 *L. G. B.*, pp. 2, 3. These circular letters are set out in Appendix D, p. 404.

[2] 2 *L. G. B.*, p. 85; and also by overcrowding.

[3] While the schools were being put into a sanitary state, between 300 and 400 of the worst cases of ophthalmia were transferred to a separate building in Whitechapel, the managers of the schools carrying out the suggestion "with very great energy and loyalty." (Evidence of Dr. Bridges before the Departmental Committee, Q. 635.)

[4] See 4 *L. G. B.*, p. xxv. Dr. Bridges' evidence before the Departmental Committee. (Q. 635.) Probation wards were established in which every child coming in was very carefully examined, and a rule was made that no child with any degree of ophthalmia, however slight, was to be allowed to enter the school. It was to be kept elsewhere. (*Ibid.*) Mr. Nettleship, who has always favoured the separation and treatment of all ophthalmic children (whether admitted from without the schools or from within) in one or more isolation or quarantine schools, referred in his exhaustive Report on Ophthalmia in 1874 to the Anerley Schools as having them a better prospect of permanent freedom from the disease than other schools on account of their improved structure and régime.

[5] Report of Departmental Committee, p. 23.

interesting fact that for fifteen months there was not a single death in the Swinton Schools, and that in twelve months, with 700 children in the schools, there were only an average of 2·5 cases of ophthalmia and 0·25 cases of itch under treatment per week. The Medical Officer (Mr. W. F. O'Grady, L.R.C.P.) has had fifteen years' experience in these schools. The quarantine is strictly observed, children remaining in the ward a fortnight before being drafted into the schools."

But, in spite of the greatest vigilance, there is always the possibility of outbreaks of infectious disease in large schools, and there can be no doubt that the greater the aggregation of children, the greater is the risk of any disease spreading. Still, whether the schools be large or small—whether arranged on the "barrack," "cottage home," or "detached home" systems—the same precautions will have to be observed, and by getting rid of the "barrack" schools it does not by any means follow that "ophthalmia" will be got rid of, for probably the majority of the children who come under the control of the Guardians are predisposed to this and other diseases by the nature of their home surroundings.

It is, of course, beyond our power to deal fully with this question of ophthalmia. Voluminous reports have been written on the subject, to which we must refer those who wish to know more about it.[1]

The worst outbreaks of infectious disease in large schools seem in most cases to have been caused by overcrowding.

Mr. Tufnell was fully alive to this danger, and attributed many of the objections made to large schools to this cause. He said, "If we put 1000 children into an establishment fitted only for 800, of course difficulties immediately arise, owing to the increased numbers. This has actually been the case in several of the large London schools during the past year (1869). They have been overcrowded, and hence complaints of the aggregation of large numbers, which would never have occurred if no school had contained more children than that for which it was built."[2]

This defect is a serious one, and the tendency of the London Boards of Guardians has been hitherto to overcrowd the schools. The reason is mainly an economical one. "In the case of a workhouse the Guardians cannot draw from the common poor fund any sum in excess of their certificate, but in the case of schools they are

[1] Notably Mr. Nettleship's Report, 4 *L. G. B.*, p. 55; Dr. Bridges' Reports, 3 *L. G. B.*, p. 210, and 19 *L. G. B.*, p. 161; and Dr. Mouat's Report, 3 *L. G. B.*, p. 232. Dr. Stephenson's Report (1897) gives the latest particulars.
[2] 22 *P. L. B.*, p. 116.

entitled to charge the whole of the maintenance of the children in these schools irrespective of the certificate, so that there is every inducement to Guardians to remove them from the workhouse."[1] Of course, the practice acts by no means economically, because overcrowding not only favours outbreaks of disease, but also, if an outbreak does occur, renders it much more difficult and costly to prevent the disease spreading than at ordinary times. We should have expected some suggestion from the Departmental Committee as to how this overcrowding was to be prevented, but all the advice given is (1) "that the minimum cubic space" (now laid down as three hundred feet) "allowed for each child be increased," and (2) "that such minimum space be further and progressively increased with any increase in the number of children aggregated in one dormitory."[2] But as the Committee also recommend that "the existing schools be not enlarged,"[3] and "that the numbers for which they are at present certified be considerably reduced," the question arises what is to be done with the surplus children? Are they to be left in the workhouse? The only answer we get from the Committee is, "Establish the new Central Authority we ask for, and everything will be arranged." But there are many people keenly interested in the question who are not thus willing to give a "blank cheque" to such an amount to a new authority, the constitution of which is left so much in the dark.

We can only hope that the earnest attention of the Guardians will be directed to the important matters of overcrowding and sufficient ventilation.

But although the system is liable to all these defects they are by no means inherent in it, nor impossible to remedy, and taking the system at its worst, it cannot be denied that it has had a depauperising effect. The evidence on this point is particularly strong. As early as 1869 Mr. Tufnell reported that it was "a very rare circumstance for any child brought up in these large pauper schools to fail to maintain an independent livelihood when launched into the world," and he said that he had "ascertained that not four per cent. of those reared in these establishments fail to become independent workpeople."[4]

[1] Evidence of Dr. Downes before the Departmental Committee (Q. 8763).
[2] Report, p. 20. [3] *Ibid.*, p. 16.
[4] 22 *P. L. B.*, p. 114, and 23 *P. L. B.*, p. 209. Mr. Tufnell prints several most interesting letters in his Report for 1873 in illustration of his statement, which he again emphasises. See 3 *L. G. B.*, p. 245.

Saturday afternoon. As a rule, the same friends are not expected to come oftener than once a month, but this regulation is not rigidly adhered to. The children write letters to their friends at least once a month as occasion may require.

The Schools Committee attend every week, one week for business and the other for visiting. There is no official visiting by ladies, but one of the lady Guardians is very indefatigable in the discharge of her duties, and is of great help in the work of the schools.

There is little difficulty in getting boys out to service, although they go off more slowly than formerly. The collieries do not now absorb such a large number of them as they used to do. The demand for girls much exceeds the supply, many applicants having to be refused.

The girls are sent from the schools to a training home in the neighbourhood for six months, the Guardians paying for their maintenance therein 5*s.* per head per week. The Institution is private, conducted and governed by charitably-disposed ladies. It is principally supported by voluntary contributions. The girls during their training in this Home are sent out to assist in ladies' houses. The Home is in a large residential district. If a girl returns to the schools from a situation she is sent back to the training home. The girls are visited in their situations by one of the lady Guardians, who is a member of the Girls' Friendly Society.[1]

The cost of the schools is about 5*s.* 5*d.* per head per week for each child.

Finally, from the Report of a deputation from the Newcastle Board of Guardians in 1894 we gather that "the children in the Swinton Schools are well clothed. They are, as a rule, very bright in appearance. They are evidently carefully educated and trained, and they have altogether a better appearance and a more contented look than the children in workhouse schools usually present. It is found, however, that the temporary cases, that is to say, children who are taken out frequently, and sometimes for short periods, by their relatives, are very difficult to deal with. Mr. Birkby would solve the difficulty by giving Guardians increased powers of detention. We deal fully with this question in another chapter.[2]

We would recommend those who are anxious to know more about the work which is carried on in a large Poor Law School to consult the annual Reports of the schools. For example, we can specially refer them to the Report of the Managers of the Forest Gate District School for the year ended Lady-day, 1897.

[1] Report of Newcastle Deputation, 1894. [2] Chapter xii.

CHAPTER V.

THE "COTTAGE HOMES" AND "ISOLATED HOMES" SYSTEMS

Section I. THE "COTTAGE HOMES" SYSTEM.

THE "Cottage Homes" system was introduced in order to remedy certain defects which seemed to be ineradicably implanted in the so-called "barrack" schools, and to which we have referred in the preceding chapter. The idea was taken from Mettray. The system is sometimes confused with those of "detached or isolated Homes," and of "boarding-out," but it has little in common with either. It is correctly described as "a little colony of separate homes, substituted for one large residential establishment."[1] The Cottage Homes with their adjuncts, the chapel, the infectious hospital, the class rooms, swimming baths, the playing fields, farm, etc., are, however, situated on one compact area with the same boundary fences and iron entrance gates, as in the case of a "barrack school." The main difference, and a most important one, between them and "barrack schools" is that the children are housed in cottage-like buildings, each cottage being superintended by paid officers of the Guardians, who act as foster parents to the children, and are called "fathers" and "mothers." The boys' cottages are generally placed under the care of a married couple, the husband being as a rule one of the industrial trainers, while the girls' cottages are each superintended by a single woman or widow. The numbers of the children in each cottage vary in the different homes; for instance, at Banstead there are twenty-six beds in the girls' cottage, and forty beds in the boys'; and at Hornchurch, Fazakerley, and Marston Green, each cottage has thirty beds. The opinion of the Departmental Committee was that no Cottage Home should contain more than fifteen children,[2] and in the new Homes arranged to be built at Styal (Chorlton Union) there are to be twelve homes of twenty beds each, and four smaller homes of ten beds each. The

[1] Report of the Departmental Committee on Metropolitan Poor Law Schools, p. 101. [2] Report, p. 107.

The advantages of Cottage Homes over the aggregated schools are undeniable, and they are set out fully in the Report of the Departmental Committee.[1] These advantages lie (1) in the nearer approach to family life, (2) in the dietary, and (3) in the greater facilities for good industrial training, and (4) in better health results.

The Departmental Committee also refer to the greater freedom of life enjoyed by the children in these homes than it is possible to secure in overgrown "aggregated" schools.

(1) *The Family Life.*

There is a certain kind of family life: the children in each Cottage Home are of varying ages, the infants (boys and girls) being distributed through the girls' homes, and the little boys being removed at seven years of age to the boys' homes.

"When children who have been discharged are re-admitted to the schools, they are returned to the cottage they were in before if there is room for them, and if not, they await the first opportunity of such return. Care is also taken to place brothers and sisters together, subject to the regulation which separates boys and girls at the age of seven."[2]

(2) *The Dietary.*

Although we do not think it would be impossible in aggregated schools to arrange for a more economical distribution of food, there can be no doubt that in the Cottage Homes this desideratum is rendered easier of attainment.

"The foster mother is supplied with certain quantities (of food) each week, sufficient for the number of the children in the home, and it is left to her judgment to see that the food is properly cooked and distributed among the children."[3]

(3) *Industrial Training.*[4]

Here again the Cottage Home facilitates the girls learning to do washing and working in the way which will be most useful to them in after life; and as the boys may be put in a cottage with a foster father who is also their teacher in the industrial shop, he has the opportunity of supervising them both there and at home.

We have already[5] commented on the effect which the recent Order on "Industrial Training" may have on the industrial training at present given in the large schools. Most of the managing authorities of

[1] Report, pp. 102–104. [2] *Ibid.*, p. 102. [3] *Ibid.*
[4] See *post*, pp. 151–154. [5] *Ante*, p. 104.

Cottage Homes are up in arms against it, as it will affect their work most seriously, and, in their opinion, act most disadvantageously for the children.

(4) *Better Health Results.*

It is impossible to doubt that where the children in any institution are divided up into small groups the risk of the spread of infectious diseases is much lessened. As Dr. Downes said in his evidence before the Departmental Committee:[1] "If you put ten apples in a barrel, one amongst them being a diseased apple, that diseased apple can only affect nine others. If you have a hundred, the risk is extended to ninety-nine."

But, except for the increased risk, we cannot say that the evidence given before the Departmental Committee satisfies us that where the "barrack schools" are properly arranged as to ventilation, and the children have sufficient exercise, they show any worse "health" results than the Cottage Homes. We have already referred to the Swinton Schools as an example of this.[2]

Cost of Cottage Homes.

The only real objection that we can see to the Cottage Homes system relates to cost, but taking the two London ones, Banstead and Hornchurch, the average weekly cost per child, exclusive of loans, is 7*s.* 7½*d.* and 9*s.* 9¾*d.* respectively, and as the average weekly cost for all the Metropolitan schools is 9*s.* 1½*d.*, this question of cost should not prevent Boards of Guardians from adopting the plan wherever possible. The cost of the Marston Green Cottage Homes near Birmingham averages 6*s.* 6½*d.* per head (exclusive of capital charges), and the Guardians find it cheaper than maintaining and educating the children in a workhouse school, which they estimate at 7*s.* 0½*d.* per head.

From an excellent Report of a Deputation appointed by the Newcastle-on-Tyne Board of Guardians to visit certain provincial separate schools and cottage homes, we extract the following particulars relating to the cost of those schools:

[1] Evidence, Q. 8725.

[2] *Ante*, p. 123. Mr. Byam Davies, writing in 1881, tells us that at the Marston Green Cottage Homes only forty-seven children out of 400 had been admitted to the infirmary during the last nine months of that year. "If there is one thing," he continues, "that strikes one more than another on visiting the school, it is the bright and happy appearance of the children." Having visited the Homes ourselves recently, we can say the same, and indeed no visitor can fail to be impressed by the healthy, happy, and contented look of the children.

There is separate accommodation for the boys and the girls. Some of the children who belong to the "ins and outs" class never get beyond the ward, as during the fortnight their parents may be discharged from the workhouse, when they have to join them again. The ward is under the charge of the porter and portress, who are a married couple and live there.

The Cottages. Six of these are for boys over seven years of age, and five for girls and for infants under seven. The girls have thus the advantage of being associated with small children, and have, under the general control of the foster mother, to care for them and wait upon them at meals. In each girls' cottage a single-bedded room is set apart for girls who are about to leave for service. This room the girl who is going out to service occupies for as long a time as possible before leaving, so as to accustom her to looking after and tidying up an ordinary servant's room. It is furnished with the usual bedroom furniture. The elder girls help in cooking the meals in each cottage, and with the assistance of a washerwoman, as in many ordinary households, do all the washing. The girls' cottages are superintended by a single woman or a widow, and the boys' cottages by married couples, the husband being engaged as industrial trainer. The boys also do all the washing of their cottages with assistance, as in the case of the girls. The children work in the cottage gardens in simple kinds of garden work. Three washerwomen or charwomen in all are called in to help in the work of the cottages.

The Workshops. These consist of a bakehouse and the several shops of the engineers and mechanics, shoemakers, painters, carpenters, and tailors. All the trainers are resident except the tailor. There is also a needle-room for the girls.

The Swimming Bath. This is forty feet long by thirty broad, and all the boys and girls in the school have learnt to swim by the time they leave, if they remain long enough in the schools to do so.

The Infirmary. This is entirely shut off from the rest of the premises; and it is so absolutely isolated from the other buildings that children from the workhouse suffering from affections of the scalp, skin, or eyes are sent to it, without the slightest risk of infection to the permanent inmates of the Homes. Serious infectious diseases, such as scarlet fever, diphtheria, and smallpox (should they arise) are not treated here, but are promptly sent off to the Hospitals of the Metropolitan Asylums Board.

The Infirmary Cottages. One of these is used for cases of ringworm and skin disease, and the other for ophthalmic cases. The same may be said of these as of the Infirmary.

No child is kept in the workhouse longer than fourteen days, unless there is any reason to suspect that he may convey infectious disease to the schools. A double precaution is taken, for after a child has been sent from the workhouse to the schools, although certified by the Medical Officer as a healthy child, he is again detained for a further fortnight in the probationary ward.

Schoolrooms. There are separate schoolrooms (1) for boys, (2) for girls, and (3) for infants. All the teachers are non-resident.

Half-timers. The *minimum* age at which children are exempted from school for half-time is eleven, if they have passed the 3rd Standard; but a few children over thirteen and fourteen who have not passed this standard are on account of their age also exempted. The opportunities of boys as half-timers are considerably limited, as they must, in turn, assist in the Homes one and a half or two and a half days per week. The average number of boys in the shops in 1894 was as follows: in the tailor's, twelve; in the shoemaker's, nine; in the baker's, six; in the carpenter's, seven; and in the engineer's, seven. The superintendent of the schools comments on this as follows:

"The number of children available for technical instruction in the shops depends chiefly upon the scholars in the school passing their standards successfully and regularly year by year, so that they may be legally and profitably exempted from school attendance. Apart from the question of efficient instruction in ordinary elementary school subjects, it is therefore most desirable that the school should be sufficiently and efficiently staffed. This is an important matter in ordinary Board Schools, and more important still in such schools as ours, where the most neglected children are received. I am of opinion that, in order to have more children available for technical instruction, more helpers (scrubbers, etc.) should be hired to do the washing and scrubbing. I think it would be well to place our schools, so far as education is concerned, under the Education Department, thus giving teacher and scholars the same opportunities and advantages as they would have in an ordinary Board School."[1]

Ordinary instruction of girls. Needlework is taught in school and in the Homes, and plain cooking is taught in each home to the elder girls. About fifty out of 115 girls over seven were being taught cooking at the end of 1894.[2]

Behaviour of children. This is, on the whole, very good, considering the antecedents of the children. The most troublesome children are those who, when first admitted to the schools, are already big boys or girls, with a long previous training in bad ways.

Playground, amusements, games, excursions, mental and physical

[1] Evidence before Departmental Committee, vol. iii. p. 14. [2] *Ibid.*

improvement, etc. A large field is set apart as a playground, in addition to a gravelled playground with giant's stride, horizontal bars and gymnastic apparatus, and a tar-paved playground behind each cottage, and every freedom is allowed for play in the broad roadway running between the cottages. At least once a week the children are taken out for walking exercise by their foster-parents, and opportunities are afforded them for making little purchases in the neighbouring town lying on one side and in the village on the other side of the Homes. The elder boys are employed as messengers and to fetch and carry parcels to and from the railway station and town, for the conveyance of which a donkey cart is used. The girls are frequently taken by the foster-mothers on shopping expeditions. Cricket and football are extensively played, and matches take place almost weekly with the boys of neighbouring clubs and schools. At varying intervals excursions to the seaside and to London are organized, and to local events of a suitable character the children, or detachments of them, are generally invited.

Visits to the children by their relations and friends are allowed fortnightly on the authority of an order obtained at the Guardians' offices. The kindness of many friends provides further means for the children's enjoyment. Thus during 1896 parties of them have been taken to the Indian Exhibition, St. Paul's Cathedral, Westminster Abbey, the Tower Bridge, the Parks, Epping Forest, and Southend-on-Sea, in addition to local athletic sports and flower-shows.

The boys construct kites, toy windmills, and little box-greenhouses for their gardens, and a few prepare magic lantern slides. The girls occasionally dress dolls, do crochet work, and construct cardboard houses, etc., from cut-out designs.[1]

There is a library, which is under the superintendence of the head teachers, the children keeping the books they happen to be reading on book-racks in the dining-room of the cottage, or on the day-room table.

Employment. No difficulty has ever been experienced in finding good situations as young servants for the girls who have been any time in the Homes, and satisfactory reports upon almost all of them are received from the M. A. B. Y. S.

As to the boys, every effort is made to find them such employment as they have been trained to, and in which they have acquired a certain degree of proficiency. The average number of boys who enter army bands each year is six. According to the evidence given to the Departmental Committee in 1893, of eighteen boys sent out, two went

[1] Evidence before Departmental Committee, vol. iii. p. 18.

out as bakers, six to military bands (enlisted), two as carpenters, two as shoemakers, one to grocery, one to a sugar factory, one to a chemist, one as gardener, and two to Working Boys' Homes; while in 1894, of thirteen sent out, five went to military bands (enlisted), five to Working Boys' Homes, one to a chemist, one as page, and one to grocery.[1]

Both boys and girls do well, and do not come back to the workhouse. As regards "after care," those boys who go to Working Boys' Homes are there, of course, under daily supervision. But the general relieving officer employed by the Guardians makes a report to them periodically upon the welfare of all the boys.

Cost of the Homes. During the year ended Lady-day, 1896, the cost of the Homes averaged £30 4*s.* 4½*d.* per head, and for maintenance alone £12 7*s.* 7*d.* per head. This cost is, of course, very great, and has increased since the starting of the Homes. It must, however, be remembered that the workhouse children make use of the infirmaries at the Homes, and this entails a considerable addition to the staff. The two new infirmary cottages are of the most perfect description, and the furnishing of them was included in the year's cost. There does not, however, seem any reason why, after the initial outlay of construction, etc., the cost of Cottage Homes should exceed that of barrack schools. But even if it should, the additional advantage gained might be considered well worth the extra expense.

Mr. Wyndham Holgate, who, as we have seen, regarded the experiment of Cottage Homes with some mistrust, gives an interesting account of the Elham Union Cottage Homes in Kent in his Report for 1892. He referred to them for the first time in his 1889 Report as follows:[2]

"A modified form of Cottage Homes has been opened during the last few weeks for the children belonging to the Elham Union in Kent, about fifty in number, which I sincerely trust may prove successful. The Guardians have bought a plot of ground of two acres in a village some three miles from the workhouse, and have thereon erected one large double cottage for the elder children and one smaller building for the infants. These homes, which are very picturesque, are within easy reach of neighbouring elementary schools, which the children attend; and they are under the care of a married couple as foster parents, the husband working in the garden, and the wife attending to the domestic duties, with a qualified nurse as assistant, and residing in the infants' cottage. He pointed out, however, a difficulty which might arise in the number of the paid officers, for 'with so small a body of children,' the number of those who by age, strength, and school standing were available for the industrial requirements of the establishment were to be very limited, certainly not more than one in every five. He said

[1] Vol. iii. p. 20. [2] 18 *L. G. B.*, p. 152.

that time alone would show whether it was possible to maintain the kitchen, the laundry, the needlework, and the garden, besides all the minor household duties, in proper condition with only two trainers and an assistant."[1]

The next year he again reported on the school as follows:[2]

"In my Report for 1888 I alluded to the recently opened cottages at Cheriton for the children of the Elham Union in Kent. The result of the first year's working of the place is highly satisfactory. I have rarely seen so marked a change as has taken place in these children. They are now as bright, healthy, and happy as they were formerly depressed both in mind and body. The teachers of the schools which they attend speak well of their good behaviour and improving intelligence; whilst their foster-parents, though very much pressed with the constant and heavy work of the institution, are evidently happy and well content."

In his Report for 1892[3] he has convinced himself of the soundness of the system. He says:

"In my Report for 1888, and also in that for 1889, I referred to the Cottage Homes of the Elham Union in Kent. Now that they have been at work for more than three years I am able to speak with greater confidence as to their value, for they come nearer to the real home life of the agricultural population than any other form of Poor Law institution. The present buildings, two in number,[4] are built to accommodate fifty children; in construction and appearance they are similar to an ordinary large cottage; the rooms are small, both upstairs and down, and each bedroom contains only six beds. The surroundings are more in accordance with those of ordinary village life; the children go to the neighbouring village schools, morning and afternoon, returning to their dinner at mid-day. On Sundays they go to Sunday-school, and then attend the parish church for divine worship. All the children, both boys and girls who are old and strong enough, have some domestic duties to do in assisting the foster parents in the work of the household. The elder girls have to look after the infants, and to help in needlework, kitchen, and washing. The elder boys, in addition to housework, which they carry out very creditably, are instructed in cultivating the garden, which extends to nearly two acres, and produces sufficient vegetables for the annual consumption of the Homes. As a proof that the life of the children is a healthy one, it may be stated that no pigs are kept, as the food is well cooked and consumed with such appetite as to leave no waste on which pigs could be maintained. There has been practically no sickness, the general behaviour of the children is good, the reports from the village schools are satisfactory, and in general bearing and appearance there is a marked improvement in comparison with what they were three years ago. Since the Homes were opened in December, 1888, thirteen children

[1] 18 *L. G. B.*, p. 151. [2] 19 *L. G. B.*, p. 157. [3] 21 *L. G. B.*, p. 185.
[4] Since increased to three cottages. See *post*, p. 151.

have been sent out to service; and there are more applicants for children than can be supplied.

"The cost for provisions, clothing, and necessaries used in the Homes has been under 4*s.* per head weekly, being actually below the cost of their maintenance when in the workhouse.

"The cost of the erection of the existing buildings, including the purchase of the ground of 2 acres and 25 poles, was £2674 18*s.* 2*d.*; a further sum of £209 10*s.* 5*d.* was expended in furnishing, the bedsteads being transferred from the old schools at the workhouse."

Since the above accounts of the Homes were written, another cottage larger than the other two has been built, with a laundry for all three cottages, at a cost of £2000, and the staff has been increased by one assistant matron and a needlewoman, at salaries of £25 and £20 respectively with rations. This larger cottage is used for boys, the girls being now in a separate cottage, and the infants in the middle of the three cottages. The boys go out to service in various ways, some as apprentices and others as page boys, etc., and the girls to domestic service. None so far have been returned to the Guardians for any cause.[1]

The Elham Union is, of course, a comparatively small one. In 1891 the population was 40,928, and on 1st January, 1896, 273 paupers received indoor relief (excluding lunatics and vagrants), of whom ninety-five were children under sixteen. It is evident, therefore, that the condition of things in this Union is very different from that of a large London or provincial Union, but it seems to us that the Guardians have acted wisely in establishing this modified form of Cottage Homes.

Industrial Training.

We have described what is being done in the way of industrial training at Hornchurch.

At the Banstead Cottage Homes the boys select from those trades taught at the school the one they desire to learn, and an endeavour is made to give them two years' training between the ages of twelve and fourteen years. The practice of the schools is to do all their own work, both new and repairs, as far as possible on the premises.[2] This work includes carpentering, shoemaking, tailoring, smithing, plumbing, painting, glazing, baking, gardening. The girls

[1] From information kindly supplied to me by Mr. R. Lonergan, the Clerk to the Guardians.
[2] A list of the work thus done will be found in the Fifth Report of the Homes, pp. 42 and 52. It will be a surprise to those who are under the impression that the boys learn nothing in the large Metropolitan schools.

do the needlework, knitting, and the elder ones do their own washing in the small washhouse attached to each cottage, except some heavy articles which are sent to the general laundry. They also assist in the ironing and cooking; and both boys and girls in the several cottages learn the necessary work of cleaning, bed-making, and the usual domestic duties. Some fruit-trees have been planted in every garden attached to the several cottages, and many of the children have their own little allotments of ground in the cottage garden which they cultivate for their own pleasure.

"The painting and graining, etc., includes the whole of the premises, both internal and external, of thirty-six buildings and several workshops. Our bread is all made in our own bakery, and this amounts to about 60,000 fourpenny loaves yearly. The boots and shoes are all made in our shops, and during the period to which this report relates—

	Equal Yearly Pairs.
In the Boys' Shoe Shop 2052 pairs of boots and shoes have been made.	684
In the Boys' Shoe Shop 7087 pairs of boots and shoes have been repaired	2362
In the Girls' Shoe Shop 1492 pairs of boots and shoes have been made.	497
In the Girls' Shoe Shop 6597 pairs of boots and shoes have been repaired	2199

"In the Tailors' Shops 5387 new articles of clothing have been made of various sorts, and 7690 articles repaired, averaging yearly 1796 articles made and 2563 repaired.

"The girls' clothing, and both boys' and girls' underclothing, is also made on the premises, both in the girls' training room for needlework and also in the several cottages. Both girls and boys also knit and repair all their stockings in the several cottages, as will be seen by appended list. As regards garden work, the vegetables for the whole establishment (except part of the potatoes) have been grown in the kitchen garden, and here also some boys are employed, preference being given to those who physically need much fresh air and outdoor exercise to strengthen them."[1]

But the great advantage of large schools for boys has always been the excellent training which they receive in band music. The demand for boys for the army bands always exceeds the supply. The Banstead Schools are no exception to the rule, and "the demand for lads is so great that it often occurs that lads are selected for enlistment in consequence of their efficiency long before they are of sufficient stature, etc., to be enlisted."[2] Very satisfactory accounts are received of all these army boys, several of them having shown such aptitude as to have been sent by the military authorities to Kneller Hall.

[1] Fifth Report, p. 26. [2] *Ibid.*

As showing the excellent character of the work done, the work of several of the children was entered in the open competition at the Exhibition of the Home Arts and Industries Association, held at Sutton in 1894 and 1895—seventeen prizes and four certificates being gained in 1894, and twelve prizes and seventeen certificates in 1895 by the children for different kinds of work.[1]

The following table shows the variety of trades which the children take up when they leave the schools. It will be observed that at least one-third of the boys enter the army bands. The list gives the number of boys which have been sent to service during the three years ended Michaelmas, 1895.

	Boys.	
To same trade as taught in the School.	Bakers	4
	Carpenters	2
	Plumbers and Painters	2
	Shoemakers	7
	Smith	1
	Tailors	7
	Enlisted in Army Bands	21
	Garden	1
	Office	1
Other occupations.	Hairdressers	3
	Hotel and House Pages	5
	Fishmonger	1
	Domestic and Electrical Engineer	1
	Chimney Sweep	1
	Grocer	1
	Printers	2
	Total Boys	60
	Girls.	
Domestic Service		37
Dressmaking		2
Laundry		2
	Total Girls	41

The children sent to service are supplied with outfits; and the boxes for these, as well as the clothing, are made on the premises.

What we have said as to the industrial training at the Hornchurch and Banstead Schools may be said of the other cottage home schools. Thus, at the Marston Green Schools the trades carried on are baking, tailoring, shoemaking, carpentry, bricklaying, and gardening. "The general repairs shop includes several trades, and is such as was found in country villages a generation ago. Plumbing, pipe-fitting, painting, white-washing, anything that comes handy. A visitor in working hours would find honest work being done by the boys—work that tells on

[1] The difference in the number of prizes in 1894 and 1895 is accounted for by the fact that in the latter year the girls did not compete in needlework (they took nine prizes for this in 1894).

withdrawals. The head schoolmaster undertakes this work, of which he is joint trustee with myself.

"Children's Penny Bank.

Year ended December	1892	1893	1894	1895
Number of depositors	387	440	448	270
	£ s. d.	£ s. d.	£ s. d.	£ s. d.
Balance brought forward	15 0 8¾	16 2 9¾	27 9 1½	20 16 11
Amount of deposits	28 14 7¼	28 0 0	18 15 0½	5 5 0
Total	43 15 3½	44 2 9¾	46 4 2	26 1 11
Amount of withdrawals during year	27 12 5¾	16 13 8¼	25 7 3	18 4 8½
Amount remaining at end of year	16 2 9¾	27 9 1½	20 16 11	7 17 2½

"*Band of Hope.* The Church of England Temperance Society continues to conduct the Band of Hope meetings once a month, except during some of the summer months. The attendance is perfectly voluntary; but most of the elder children attend the meetings, and to this end every facility is afforted them.

"*Library.* The circulating Library now consists of 656 books; and during the period to which the Report relates the number of books issued has been 7699.

"*Pictures.* All the children's rooms in the cottages are supplied with these cheerful and useful aids, and their number I am glad to say has recently been added to.

"*Toys, etc.* The girls and infants have a good supply of toys and dolls, etc., and the boys have draughts and boards and similar games. At Christmas, in addition to the toys, etc., which the Board provide, the children each year receive a large parcel of toys and upwards of 500 new sixpences from the *Truth* Fund. The ladies who have so kindly done so in former years continue each Christmas to supply Christmas letters and cards for all the occupants of the homes. These are always a great pleasure to the children.

"*Recreation and Entertainments.* The elder boys are taught cricket and football, according to the season, on certain afternoons and evenings by the schoolmasters, who play with them; and the lads, being supplied with suitable flannel suits and jerseys, play matches and tournaments among the several cottages, and with other schools and clubs. The teachers take the school children out walking once a week, and the cottage parents take the children under their charge out walking at any time which does not prevent their proper school attendance, etc.

"To assist the younger children when out walking, every cottage is provided with a 'mail cart.'

"Occasionally in summer small special treats are arranged for, in addition to the annual fête and sports for the whole school. During each winter a series of evening entertainments are arranged, viz., about fifteen or sixteen each winter, consisting of magic lantern, magic and ventriloquial, musical and fancy drill, singing and recitations, the latter being by the children themselves, the boys, girls, and infants taking it in turn to give an entertainment."[1]

We have so far, then, pointed out the advantages which the Cottage Homes system has over that of the barrack school. For large urban Unions we consider it in every way preferable to the latter. The system of detached and isolated Homes, with which we shall deal next, is merely a new development of it; but the best authorities agree that such a variation might not be suitable for London; besides which the system is not yet out of the experimental stage. For smaller Unions the method adopted at Elham[2] seems to us admirable and is to be recommended. The advantage of retaining the children under the direct control of the Guardians is very great, and it is almost impossible for any case of cruelty or neglect to occur without its being immediately detected and put a stop to. Had there been any serious defects in the system they would certainly not have escaped the notice of the Departmental Committee, and the only recommendations they have to make is (1) that, where practicable, not more than two cottages be established in close proximity; (2) that such cottages be placed within reasonable distance of settled habitations; and (3) that in no case should a cottage contain more than fifteen children. As regards the first of these recommendations we can only say that it strikes at the root of the whole system, which is modelled on that of a "village community," with its cottages, church, schools, industrial shops, swimming bath, recreation ground, etc., complete, and implies the adoption of the system which we now proceed to describe.

Section II.

THE "ISOLATED (OR SCATTERED) HOMES" SYSTEM.

To Mr. J. Wycliffe Wilson, the Chairman of the Sheffield Board of Guardians, must be given the credit of originating and engineering this interesting development of the system of Cottage Homes.[3] He has given the following account of how it came into being.[4]

[1] A list of the various entertainments given at the schools during seven years (1888 to 1895) will be found in Mr. Harston's evidence before the Departmental Committee, p. 306.

[2] See *ante*, pp. 149–151.

[3] Paper read by Mr. P. Ashberry at the Yorkshire Poor Law Conference, 1895. (Knight & Co.)

[4] Evidence before Departmental Committee on Metropolitan Schools, p. 443, quoted in the Report at p. 128.

condition. These medical men visit the home at least once a month, and as many times besides as the condition of the children requires.[1]

"The City Fever Hospital is utilized for such complaints as small-pox, scarlet fever, or typhoid, while infectious cases of a less serious character are removed to the Poor Law Children's Hospital at head-quarters, where other complaints are dealt with. For trifling ailments, or such as it would be dangerous to remove, the children are nursed in the cottages."[2]

A superintendent officer is charged with the duty of supervising the homes, and the matron, who is concerned chiefly with the supervision of domestic details, makes frequent visits to them. These two officers are the head officials of the *whole system* of "The Children's Homes," and are responsible to the Guardians for every branch of the work. A constant unofficial supervision is also exercised by the school teachers and the clergy and ministers whose churches and schools the children attend, as well as by the neighbours, whose sympathies have been enlisted on behalf of the children.[3] Further than this, each home is in the special charge of two or three Guardians, one of whom undertakes to visit it each week at irregular times, and the Homes Visiting Committee, which includes the lady Guardian, pays an official visit to each home once in every four weeks.[4]

The stores for the homes are all supplied from headquarters, except milk and coals, which the tradespeople deliver directly to each home. And as regards the clothes, the whole of the girls' and part of the boys' clothing are made in the homes or at headquarters, and sent to the foster mothers for the children's use.[5]

With respect to the cost of the system there has been a good deal of dispute.

In a letter to the *Poor Law Officers' Journal* (14th August, 1896), Mr. Wycliffe Wilson gave the following figures, the table enabling a comparison to be made between the cost of the Sheffield system and that of barrack schools and Cottage Homes:

[1] Report of Departmental Committee, p. 125. [2] *Ibid.*, p. 125.
[3] An amusing example of this interest was given by Mr. Ashberry before the Departmental Committee. (See Q. 11,553.)
[4] Report, p. 125. [5] *Ibid.*, p. 125.

Detailed Comparative Return, shewing Total and Average Weekly Cost per Child.

	Sheffield Children's Homes.				Marston Green Cottage Homes.		Forest Gate District School.	
	For 22 weeks—Oct. 27, 1894, to Mar. 25, 1895		For 52 weeks—to Mar. 28, 1896.		For 52 weeks—to Lady-day, 1895.		For 52 weeks—to Lady-day, 1895.	
Average No. of Children.	239		269		408		694	
	Total Cost £	Average s. d.	Total Cost £	Average s. d.	Total Cost £	Average s. d.	Total Cost £	Average s. d.
Children—								
Provisions	504	1 11	1339	* 1 11	1008	1 6½	4090	2 0½
Necessaries	159	0 7½	403	0 6½	663	0 7½	1678	0 11½
Clothing	221	0 10½	437	0 7½	519	0 3½	1230	0 8½
General Charges	55	0 2½	108	† 0 1½	363	0 4½	1410	0 9½
Officials (all charges)—								
Superintendent, Matron, Medical Officers, Joiner, Handy-man, Groom and Gardener, Laundress, and Sewing Mistress	140	0 6½	431	‡ 0 7½	1433	‖ 1 4½	3165	‖ 1 10½
Laundry and Washerwomen	48	0 2½	310	§ 0 5½				
Foster Parents	479	1 9½	1117	1 7	1264	1 0½		
Repairs	46	0 2½	126	0 2½	388	0 4½	1000	0 7½
Furniture and Property Renewals	44	0 2	72	0 1½	366	0 4	673	0 4½
		6 5		6 2½		6 3		8 8½
Rents Scattered Homes, £318 10s.; Rates, £47 18s. 1d; Taxes, £10 12s.; Insurance, £8 8s.			385	0 6½				
Repayment of Loans, with Interest			954	1 4½		0 1½	1767	1 0
				8 1½		8 4½		9 8½

* Includes cost of medical extras for Children's Hospital.
† Includes stable, garden, dispensary, funeral, and establishment charges.
‡ Does not include cost of Nurses. It is difficult to compare cost of our Children's Hospital with other systems, as we treat all the children there; whereas in the case of most Cottage Homes Villages the Chronics and Ins-and-Outs are kept in the Workhouse Hospital.
§ Large increase due to Children's Hospital and slightly increased help at Homes, owing to small number of elder girls. ‖ Includes school.

The Departmental Committee further say:

"In comparing the cost of the Sheffield scheme with other systems of Cottage Homes or village communities, it must be borne in mind that at Sheffield the Guardians provide in the homes for the fluctuating class of children known as 'ins and outs.' They find it necessary, therefore, to reserve accommodation in the homes for these children, whilst under nearly all other systems these children are temporarily accommodated in the workhouse, and the school managers are consequently able to keep the Cottage Homes constantly full. The average number of children in the homes at Sheffield must therefore be considerably below the total capacity of the homes, and as far as all fixed charges are concerned the average cost per child is proportionately increased."[1]

No reference, however, is given to any evidence which supports the above statement. It must be borne in mind that at Sheffield the "ins and outs" children are retained at headquarters, just as at Kensington

[1] Report, p. 128.

this class is retained at the branch school at Hammersmith. The true inference to be drawn from the fact seems to us to be that the Sheffield Guardians are relieved of a difficulty which can only be met in other school systems by establishments such as that at Hammersmith.[1]

The advantages of the Sheffield system in the opinion of its supporters were stated by Mr. Ashberry before the Departmental Committee as follows:[2]

"1. It is the nearest approach to family life, next to boarding-out, and boarding-out is only practicable in the case of permanent children, such as orphan and deserted children.

"2. The education they receive at the Board Schools is far superior to that given to the comparatively small numbers dealt with in workhouse or cottage homes' schools.

"3. The supervision is increased by the public life the children lead in going to and from school and mixing with outside children.

"4. The isolation in small numbers lessens the dangers from infectious diseases.

"5. The cost of placing say fifteen children under the care of one 'mother' may be greater than with thirty, as in most other cottage homes, and a much larger number in barrack schools, but the smaller number renders the supervision more efficient, and makes it safe to place young boys in the same home with girls.

"6. In no other system is the 'workhouse taint' so completely removed from all children over three years of age, and in no other system, with the exception of boarding-out, are the children so likely to become self-maintaining and self-respecting members of society."

Whatever opinion we have on the first five of these propositions, we cannot admit the last one for a moment. There is really no evidence to support it.

Having thus given an account of how the system is worked, and having stated the advantages which it is alleged to possess over other systems, we must refer to some of the defects which led a Committee of the Chorlton Board of Guardians, who were appointed to inquire into the system, and who went into the inquiry with strong prejudices in its favour, to report that while it was almost perfect in theory, the dangers of it were so apparent that they could not recommend their Board to adopt it.

These dangers arise—

1. From the difficulty of securing the necessary supervision. It is not so easy to supervise a number of Cottage Homes scattered about a Union as it is where they are all close together on one single area.

2. From the difficulty which one person must have in managing satisfactorily some fifteen or sixteen children of different ages and

[1] See *post*, p. 323. [2] Evidence, Q. 11,922.

sexes in a cottage home.[1] There are few persons qualified to undertake such a task. Thus at Sheffield the changes of foster-parents have been frequent.

3. From the difficulty of providing adequate and efficient industrial training for the children;[2]

4. From the possibility that the children may have to do too much housework.

Indeed, one has only to read the Memorandum of the Local Government Board[3] as to the conditions upon which they will allow the system to be adopted, to see what trouble and care will have to be taken by Boards of Guardians in order to safeguard it against abuses, and we are by no means certain whether many Boards will be led to try it. They will certainly not find the system any cheaper than that of the barrack schools or Cottage Homes, for it must be remembered that it implies entirely separate accommodation with an adequate staff for those children who cannot be sent to the Homes at all. We have already given Mr. Wycliffe Wilson's figures.[4] These figures have been very ably criticised by Dr. J. M. Rhodes in a paper on the Report of the Departmental Committee read at the North-Western Poor Law Conference, 1896.[5] In the Report occurs the following paragraph:

"It is satisfactory to find that the cost of the children's maintenance under this Sheffield system is less than in village communities and aggregated schools. We are informed that the average cost of each child in the scattered homes is about six shillings per week, or £15 12*s.* per annum, including provisions, necessaries, and clothing, salaries and board of foster-mothers, and general repairs to the homes, whilst in the Metropolitan schools the average annual cost of maintenance is £24 per child."

In his paper Dr. Rhodes shows very clearly the unfairness of this comparison. The Committee "must have known that at first-class schools, like the Kensington and Chelsea Schools, the average cost was (exclusive of loans) £20 4*s.* 5*d.*, and at the Banstead Road Schools, Sutton, £18 10*s.* 5*d.*, and it must also be taken into account that the Sheffield figures do not include schooling." Then the Committee say that to the above sum of £15 12*s.* must be added

[1] This is a difficulty which is not felt in Cottage Homes where the possibility of classification is better.

[2] In his evidence before the Departmental Committee, Mr. Wycliffe Wilson frankly admitted that his system could not possibly compete with that of Cottage Homes in this respect, in itself a very serious objection.

[3] This memorandum is set out in full in the Appendix N., p. 425.

[4] *Ante*, p. 163. [5] *Poor Law Conferences*, 1896, pp. 260–4.

"something over £4 per child for rent." "Let us see what this 'something over £4' means. Mr. Wilson has written a letter,[1] and from Mr. Wilson's own figures it appears that 'something over £4' in the Report means just a fraction over £5 per head for rent. Of this sum 6⅝*d.* per head per week goes for the rent of houses, some of which look decidedly old, not to use a stronger term." Now the average cost in the Metropolitan schools for repayment of loans and interest, which includes schools, etc., and, of course, corresponds to "rent," was £5 2*s.* 5*d.*;[2] "but would it not have been more honest on the part of the Committee if they had pointed out that, even in the list of the Metropolitan schools they give, the average cost per child for loan repayments and interests is greater than £5 in nine and less than £5 in ten schools?"

"In the comparison which Mr. Wilson makes between the Sheffield scheme and Marston Green, there is the item 'officials: (all charges),' Sheffield 7⅜*d.*, Marston Green 1*s.* 4½*d.* There is a note, however. The Sheffield item does not include a farthing for nurses, since 'it is difficult to compare the cost of our children's hospital with other systems, as we treat all children there, whereas in the case of most cottage homes villages the chronics and ins and outs are kept in the workhouse hospital.' Why does not Mr. Wilson tell us the cost, and let us know the whole cost of the Sheffield scheme? The Marston Green 1*s.* 4½*d.* includes not only the cost of nursing at the hospital (and there was certainly one chronic case in it on one of my visits), but, as Mr. Wilson says, also includes schooling, which are not included in the Sheffield scheme, but for which the public pay in one form or another. I think if Mr. Wilson will compare his system with King's Norton he will find, and the Committee would have found, that the cost is less than it is at Sheffield. The utter absurdity of the comparison is apparent if a comparison is made as to the rent of houses in the neighbourhood of London and Sheffield."

So much for the question of cost. But if the system were so infinitely superior to that of the Cottage Homes this particular objection would not weigh with us. We cannot, however, see that it is so. Nor can we forget that the Sheffield experiment is a new one, that special dangers attach to it from which other systems are free, that those who administer it at the present time are enthusiasts for it, and that they do their utmost to prove it a success. Even admitting that it has succeeded at Sheffield, it by no means follows that it would succeed in other Unions.

[1] *Ante*, p. 162. [2] Report of Committee, p. 155.

On this point the inspectors of the Local Government Board who visited the homes in May, 1896, wrote as follows:

"The Local Government Board in sanctioning this experiment have been largely influenced by the assurance of the careful supervision which would be maintained, both by the superintendent and by the Guardians, and it appeared to them that at Sheffield, at any rate, the chairman and those interested in the scheme were so certain to take care that such supervision was adequately carried out, that probable shortcomings in this important particular elsewhere must be taken into consideration in dealing with applications from others to be allowed to adopt a similar scheme. If there has been already appreciable failure in supervision under such very special circumstances as at Sheffield, what may be looked for elsewhere, when the freshness of the interest has waned both on the part of the Guardians and of the public?"

In London the system would be difficult to carry out satisfactorily,[1] and as to other Unions, the conditions which the Central Authority have attached to its adoption will probably make Boards of Guardians in large towns think twice before they follow Sheffield's lead. None the less, however, would we withhold our admiration for the care with which the originators of the system have worked out the details of it, and the skill which they have shown in carrying their plan into execution.

[1] The Whitechapel Union, however, having separated itself from the Forest Gate School District, has adopted this system. Four pairs of semi-detached cottages are to be provided, each for ten children of mixed ages and both sexes, as well as one cottage for twenty boys who, by reason of age, may be inadmissible into a "mixed" cottage. The scheme, which will be found in Appendix O. (*post*, p. 427), has received the "general assent" of the Local Government Board, but the assent has only been given on account of the "*comparatively small number of children to be dealt with.*" The experiment will be watched with interest; but the conditions of Whitechapel are peculiar, and it by no means follows that, if the scheme be successful, it could be safely imitated by other London Boards of Guardians.

4100-1

3 2044 009 936 030

THE BORROWER WILL BE CHARGED AN OVERDUE FEE IF THIS BOOK IS NOT RETURNED TO THE LIBRARY ON OR BEFORE THE LAST DATE STAMPED BELOW. NON-RECEIPT OF OVERDUE NOTICES DOES NOT EXEMPT THE BORROWER FROM OVERDUE FEES.

WIDENER
CANCELLED
BOOK DUE
DEC 2 0 1991
SEP 1 0 1991

WIDENER
SEP 1 0 1997
NOV 0 3 1997
BOOK DUE
CANCELLED

WIDENER
DEC 2 3 1996
BOOK DUE

STALL-STUDY
CHARGE
WIDENER
CANCELLED